DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 414	JC 920 067

AUTHOR	Vaughan, George B., Ed.; Palmer, James C., Ed.
TITLE	Enhancing Teaching and Administration through Scholarship.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	ISBN-1-55542-768-5; ISSN-0194-3081
PUB DATE	91
CONTRACT	RI88062002
NOTE	88p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104 ($15.95).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
JOURNAL CIT	New Directions for Community Colleges; v19 n4 Win 1991
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Deans; Action Research; Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Role; College Faculty; College Presidents; *Community Colleges; *Faculty College Relationship; Institutional Role; *Instructional Improvement; Leadership Responsibility; Literature Reviews; *Noninstructional Responsibility; Recognition (Achievement); Research Opportunities; Research Skills; *Scholarship; Teacher Role; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This collection of essays examines the importance of scholarship to the community college and suggests approaches that community college leaders can take to promote a sense of professionalism built around scholarly work. In Chapter 1, "Scholarship and the Community College Professional: Focusing the Debate," George B. Vaughan suggests a broad definition of scholarship and examines the antipathy of the prevailing institutional culture to scholarly work beyond classroom teaching. In Chapter 2, "False Dichotomies," Jonathan Block examines the origins and implications of the false dichotomy between teaching and research. In Chapter 3, "Scholarship in the Community College: A President's Perspective," Robert E. Parilla discusses the role of the president in promoting scholarship on campus. In Chapter 4, "Presidential Scholarship and Educational Leadership in the Community College," Robert G. Templin, Jr., notes the importance of scholarship to the president's own leadership effectiveness. In Chapter 5, "Scholarship and the Academic Dean," James R. Perkins reviews the contributions that academic deans can make to the community college's scholarly endeavors. In Chapter 6, "Scholarship in the Humanities," Barbara Viniar and Libby Bay discuss the value of faculty scholarship to the teaching of the humanities. The final chapter, "Nurturing Scholarship at Community Colleges," by James C. Palmer, reviews major themes which need to be addressed in nurturing scholarship at the community college. (JMC)

ED341414

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Enhancing Teaching and Administration Through Scholarship

George B. Vaughan, James C. Palmer

EDITORS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

JC920067

NUMBER 76, WINTER 1991
JOSSEY-BASS INC., PUBLISHERS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Arthur M. Cohen
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Florence B. Brawer
ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Enhancing Teaching and Administration Through Scholarship

George B. Vaughan
University of Florida

James C. Palmer
George Mason University

EDITORS

Number 76, Winter 1991

JOSSEY-BASS INC., PUBLISHERS, San Francisco
MAXWELL MACMILLAN INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHING GROUP
New York • Oxford • Singapore • Sydney • Toronto

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER
ERIC
Clearinghouse For Junior Colleges
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

ENHANCING TEACHING AND ADMINISTRATION THROUGH SCHOLARSHIP
George B. Vaughan, James C. Palmer (eds.)
New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 76
Volume XIX, number 4
Arthur M. Cohen, Editor-in-Chief
Florence B. Brawer, Associate Editor

© 1991 by Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers. All rights reserved.

No part of this issue may be reproduced in any form—except for a brief quotation (not to exceed 500 words) in a review or professional work—without permission in writing from the publishers.

Microfilm copies of issues and articles are available in 16mm and 35mm, as well as microfiche in 105mm, through University Microfilms Inc., 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

LC 85-644753 ISSN 0194-3081 ISBN 1-55542-768-5

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES is part of The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series and is published quarterly by Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, California 94104-1310 (publication number USPS 121-710) in association with the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. Second-class postage paid at San Francisco, California, and at additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to New Directions for Community Colleges, Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, California 94104-1310.

SUBSCRIPTIONS for 1991 cost $48.00 for individuals and $70.00 for institutions, agencies, and libraries.

THE MATERIAL in this publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number RI-88-062002. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE should be sent to the Editor-in-Chief, Arthur M. Cohen, at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

Cover photograph by Rene Sheret, Los Angeles, California © 1990.

Printed on acid-free paper in the United States of America.

CONTENTS

EDITORS' NOTES 1
George B. Vaughan, James C. Palmer

1. Scholarship and the Community College Professional: Focusing the Debate 3
George B. Vaughan
One issue facing the community college is the need for both faculty and administrators to change their existing attitudes toward scholarship and to view it from the perspective of the community college mission.

2. False Dichotomies 17
Jonathan Block
Community colleges have developed a culture that is increasingly out of step with the orientation of their faculties, and this dissonance has limited their ability to respond to the changing needs of their communities, students, faculties, and society as a whole.

3. Scholarship in the Community College: A President's Perspective 27
Robert E. Parilla
It is time for community college presidents to affirm the concept of "scholar-professor" on their campuses.

4. Presidential Scholarship and Educational Leadership in the Community College 39
Robert G. Templin, Jr.
Presidents who engage in scholarly pursuits are more effective educational leaders.

5. Scholarship and the Academic Dean 49
James R. Perkins
As the institution's instructional leader, the community college academic dean can help establish scholarship as an integral part of the campus environment.

6. Scholarship in the Humanities 59
Barbara Viniar, Libby Bay
If humanities faculty are not engaged in scholarship, if they are not active learners, they cannot effectively instruct students on the insights and skills that study in the humanities properly fosters.

7. Nurturing Scholarship at Community Colleges 69
James C. Palmer
Professionals in all organizations need to be reminded periodically of their larger responsibilities, those that go beyond the day-to-day expectations of their jobs.

INDEX 79

EDITORS' NOTES

In 1988, the senior editor of this volume published the article "Scholarship in Community Colleges: The Path to Respect" (Vaughan, 1988). The premise of the article was that community college educators have failed to define scholarship in relationship to their professional roles and hence have neglected their obligations as scholars. Clinging to the false belief that scholarship is tied solely to original research, community college educators have failed to see the numerous other ways that faculty and administrators can make scholarly contributions and thus enhance the reputation of the community college as an institution of higher learning.

In the time since that article was published, the issue of scholarship has come to the fore, in discussions of both community college education and higher education in general. The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988, p. 26) called for the recognition of a broad definition of scholarship that goes beyond traditional research to include "*integrating* knowledge, through curriculum development, . . . *applying* knowledge, through service, and . . . *presenting* knowledge, through effective teaching." Recently, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching released a report calling for the application of a broader definition of scholarship appropriate for all segments of higher education (Boyer, 1990). The foundation's report recognizes that only a relatively small proportion of four-year college faculty engage in meaningful, original research and that other scholarly pursuits need to be recognized.

This volume, *Enhancing Teaching and Administration Through Scholarship,* examines the importance of scholarship to the community college and suggests approaches that community college leaders can take to promote a sense of professionalism built around scholarly work. In Chapter One, George B. Vaughan reviews the broad definition of scholarship and examines the antipathy of the prevailing institutional culture to scholarly work beyond classroom teaching. In Chapter Two, Jonathan Block examines the origins and implications of the false dichotomy between teaching and research. In Chapters Three and Four, Robert E. Parilla and Robert G. Templin, Jr., respectively, discuss the role of the president in promoting scholarship on campus and note the importance of scholarship to the president's own leadership effectiveness. In Chapter Five, James R. Perkins reviews the contributions that academic deans can make to the community college's scholarly endeavors. In Chapter Six, Barbara Viniar and Libby Bay discuss scholarship in the humanities. In Chapter Seven, James C. Palmer concludes the volume with a review of major themes that need to be addressed in nurturing scholarship at the community college.

Scholarship is at the heart of the community college mission. It is every educator's responsibility. We hope that this volume increases awareness of the need to encourage scholarship at the community college and of the steps that college leaders can take to promote and reward the scholarly initiatives of administrators, faculty, and students.

George B. Vaughan
James C. Palmer
Editors

References

Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities in the Professoriate.* Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990. 151 pp. (ED 326 149)

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1988. 58 pp. (ED 293 578)

Vaughan, G. B. "Scholarship in Community Colleges: The Path to Respect." *Educational Record,* 1988, 69 (2), 26–31.

George B. Vaughan is professor of higher education at the University of Florida, Gainesville.

James C. Palmer is acting director of the Center for Community College Education, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia.

One issue facing the community college is the need for both faculty and administrators to change their existing attitudes toward scholarship and to view it from the perspective of the community college mission.

Scholarship and the Community College Professional: Focusing the Debate

George B. Vaughan

Recently, I heard a highly respected university president verbally wrestle with the complexities of defining the role of the university in today's society. He noted that twenty years ago concepts inherent to university life were more universally understood, applied, and accepted. One example that he used to support his argument was the role of scholarship in tenure and promotions in the academic world. He recalled that "two decades ago everyone knew what you had to do to get promoted: You had to be a scholar and everyone knew what scholarship was" (Johnson, 1990). This example illustrates the confusion surrounding scholarship when viewed from the perspective of the community college, for the speaker's belief that "everyone knew what scholarship was" has never applied to the majority of community college professionals, either in relationship to their own professional roles or in relationship to the community college's mission.

Defining the Issues

In this chapter, I discuss a number of issues and trends pertaining to scholarship in the community college context. First, community college faculty members and administrators need to change their existing attitudes toward scholarship and to view it from the perspective of the community college mission, a perspective that means rejecting many of the old notions of what constitutes scholarship and adopting new ones. Second, examples are given of scholarly activities that community college professionals are engaged in and others that they might engage in, some of which do not fit the traditional mold of what constitutes scholarship. Third, the attitudes of selected academic deans toward scholarship are presented. This discussion also includes examples of how some colleges are promoting and honoring scholarship. Finally, recommendations are offered regarding how community college professionals can enhance scholarship for themselves and their colleagues and how scholarship can become an important part of the community college culture.

Scholarship and the Culture of the Community College

The role of scholarship in community colleges cannot be understood or appreciated without an understanding of those complex values, beliefs, and assumptions that make up the culture of these institutions. One of the potential stumbling blocks that community college professionals must overcome in order to view scholarship from the perspective of the community college mission is the notion, deeply ingrained within their value system, of what constitutes scholarship in higher education, a notion that many community college faculty formed during their years in graduate school and brought with them with little change to the community college. This problem of a limited viewpoint of scholarship is magnified because many community college professionals, since leaving graduate school, have lost formal contact with what is happening within their own disciplines; therefore, not only is their conception of what constitutes acceptable scholarship caught in a time warp but so is their notion of what the focus of their scholarship should be. For example, I am told that English is no longer just English: It is political theory, it is psychology, it is linguistics, it is a number of other things as well as literature, suggesting that notions of scholarship in English cultivated in graduate schools two decades ago are, at best, limited.

The issue of the role of scholarship in relationship to the community college mission is further confused by administrative doctrine: Most community college faculty members are told upon accepting their positions that the community college is a teaching institution, which suggests in no uncertain terms that faculty need not do research. Rejection of research as a professional activity is just a step away from rejection of scholarship as a legitimate activity for community college professionals; therefore, many faculty members in these "teaching institutions" have seen little reason to examine their concepts of scholarship because there are not any practical applications or rewards for scholarly work. By accepting the premise that teaching and research are mutually exclusive activities, too many community college faculty members have failed to ask how they should define themselves as scholars as well as teachers, a relationship that is symbiotic for the outstanding teacher. As one community college faculty member exclaimed during a discussion on scholarship, "We need to be excited about scholarship again. This means that we need to get excited about our discipline again." This statement could be interpreted to mean that if one is to become excited about one's discipline, one must be a scholar.

Finally, the neglect of scholarship as a part of the community college professional's role can also be traced to the discovery by many of the faculty that by working at a community college, they are not joining a community of scholars, at least not in the sense that the term is generally used in academia. By failing to challenge their own preconceived notions brought to the community college, in this case the notion of what constitutes a community of scholars, community college professionals fail to define their own roles in ways that break with the past, and to redefine them in ways that are in concert with the community college mission.

The Task of Changing Attitudes. Changes in attitudes are difficult to bring about among faculty members, no matter how logical the changes appear to those advocating them. The task of changing the culture of an institution is even more difficult. In the case of the community college, the dominant influence on its culture has been its commitment to teaching, and rightly so. But, in accepting teaching as the community college's primary mission, its leaders in turn rejected research as an important activity for faculty and administrators. Consequently, community colleges have failed to inculcate scholarship as an important part of the community college culture. As pointed out later in this chapter, some changes in attitude are occurring; nevertheless, before scholarship is embraced as an integral part of the community college mission, some basic changes must take place among community college professionals.

Basic to changing the attitudes of community college professionals toward scholarship is the need to define scholarship in a way that conforms to and enhances fulfillment of the community college mission, including enhancement of teaching. In a number of contexts (Vaughan, 1988; Vaughan, 1989a; 1989b; 1989c; and Vaughan, 1990), I have defined scholarship as the systematic pursuit of a topic, as an objective, rational inquiry involving critical analysis. Scholarship involves precise observation, organization, and recording of information in the search for truth and order. It is the umbrella under which research is pursued, for research is but one form of scholarship. Scholarship results in a product that is shared with others and that is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product, whether it is a book review, an annotated bibliography, a lecture, a review of existing research on a topic, or a speech that synthesizes the thinking on a topic. Scholarship requires individuals to have solid foundations in their professional fields and to keep current with developments in those fields.

While my definition of scholarship is one with which most community college professionals can identify and one that is in concert with the community college's primary mission as a teaching institution, upon reflection I would broaden the definition even further: Under the umbrella of scholarship for community college professionals I would add art exhibits by teacher-artists, original essays and poems, scholarly articles in journals and other publications that are not research based (although this category is strongly implied in my original definition, I would now more explicitly refer to this type of publication), the development of original texts designed for using computers in teaching (assuming that the texts are more than the yellowed, lecture notes transferred to computer files and assuming that more than technical skills are required to place and use existing material on computer disks or hard drives), inventions and patents on inventions by technical faculty, and classroom research (faculty investigations of their own teaching). A word of caution is in order: Recognition of articles published in journals as a legitimate scholarly activity for community college professionals is not the same as the university's requirement that faculty members publish and is certainly not a call for the community college to adopt a "publish or perish" stance. By my definition, a journal article is just another example of scholarship, as is a scholarly speech on a topic, an art exhibit, or a well-constructed argument presented on the op-ed page of the Sunday newspaper supplement.

Scholarly Publications, Presidents, and Academic Deans. If scholarship is to play a prominent role in the lives of community college professionals, presidents and deans must understand the role of scholarship and be committed to promoting scholarship. In my study of the community college presidency (Vaughan, 1986), those presidents who were identified as leaders by their peers were asked to rank the skills and abilities required of a successful president and those required of the individuals who report directly to the president. The ability of presidents to produce scholarly publications was ranked last on a list of seventeen skills and abilities. The same ranking was assigned to that ability for those who report to presidents, including academic deans (Vaughan, 1986, pp. 188–193). In a subsequent study, I asked academic deans to rank the skills and abilities required of a successful dean and of those who report directly to the dean. As was the case with presidents, academic deans ranked the ability to produce scholarly publications at the bottom of the scale for themselves and for those who report to them (Vaughan, 1990, pp. 138–148).

Upon reflection, I now wonder if in tying the ranking to publications rather than to a broader definition of scholarly activities the study produced a less than clear picture of how deans and presidents view scholarly activities. One clue is found in the reactions to a statement on scholarship that I posed to academic deans who were identified as leaders by their peers: "Historically, community college professionals (faculty and administrators) have devoted little time to scholarship." (No definition of scholarship was offered in relation to this statement.) Over 95 percent of the deans responding to this survey item (fifty-eight of sixty-one deans) agreed with the statement (Vaughan, 1990, pp. 135, 155). On the other hand, as I show later, deans are sensitive to the role that scholarship plays in the academic world and therefore may be beginning to place greater emphasis on it both for themselves and for other members of the college community. One conclusion might be that community colleges are at a stage in their development where faculty members and administrators are beginning to reexamine their roles, including reconsideration of the part that scholarship should have in their professional lives. There are some indications that there are changes in the wind (Vaughan, 1989a). The fact remains, however, that academic deans and presidents do not place a relatively high value on the production of scholarly publications, either by themselves or by those who report to them. In the case of scholarly publications, as well as in other areas, the campus climate created by deans and presidents fails to promote these publications and therefore, one assumes, inhibits other members of the college community from pursuing publications as legitimate and desirable scholarly outlets.

The Rewards System. Another reason scholarship has not assumed a more prominent role in the professional activities of community college faculty members and administrators is that it is rarely a part of the rewards system. Rarely is scholarship considered in decisions about retention, tenure, and promotion. In the course of my research, one dean noted that whether or not one engages in scholarship has no bearing on tenure decisions on his campus. One of my examples regarding scholarship and the rewards system bears repeating here. A young faculty member had just published a beginning text in his teaching field. Feeling good about his accomplishment, he sat back and waited for the rewards to roll in. Indeed, within a few days after the book was published, he got the anticipated call to come to the president's office. "I was called to the president's office. I prepared myself to accept modestly his congratulations and thanks for bringing honor to the college. You can imagine my shock when he said, 'You didn't do any of this work on college time, did you?' The message was clear" (Vaughan, 1989c, p. 9). Yes, the message was indeed clear: That president on that campus at that point in time showed no understanding or appreciation for the role that scholarship can and should play in the lives of faculty members on that campus.

Killing Them Softly. The young faculty member's experience with the president was an isolated and perhaps extreme case. On the other hand, there is other evidence that the culture of the community college is not only unconducive to scholarship but also, on some campuses, even hostile to it. Seidman (1985) believes that there is a false and destructive dichotomy between teaching and research (he uses the latter as an umbrella term for the scholarly activities of faculty), and he draws on the experiences of community college faculty members to support his conclusions.

He notes that some faculty are conscious of the dichotomy and its destructiveness, but they feel that there is nothing that they can do about it. He quotes a social science faculty member: "You know for years we talked about the community college . . . as a teaching institution and not a research institution. . . . Teaching requires constant contact with information. . . . It requires that you constantly go back to the well" (Seidman, 1985, p. 253). Quoting another faculty member who spends a great deal of time on class preparation, Seidman notes that his colleagues are ambivalent toward the time devoted to class preparation. The faculty member laments, "I am sort of jokingly referred to in the department as the guy who reads all the time" (p. 254).

Seidman (1985, pp. 254-255) believes that "the dichotomy of teaching and research imposed upon and finally accepted by many community college faculty is both false and value-laden. Those who do research are higher on the educational totem pole than those who do not. As a result, the dichotomy with which community college faculty live every day takes a heavy toll on their self-respect." Seidman further criticizes requirements that faculty members spend a certain number of hours on campus, causing one faculty member to feel that he had to "sneak" to the library and "hoard" his time away from his office. He concludes that "there is a circular path of faculty action and administrative response that becomes enervating for both faculty and administration as they fail to deal with the underlying issue of the separation of research from teaching in the community college" (p. 256). This research supports the belief presented here that the culture of some community colleges is, at times, less than inviting for scholarly activities and even hostile in some instances.

Changes in Campus Climate. The culture of a community college is slow to change. On the other hand, the climate of the institution is somewhat volatile and sensitive to changes in individual attitudes, perceptions, and personnel.

The odyssey of one faculty member illustrates how the campus climate can influence attitudes toward scholarship: Upon receiving an M.S. degree in biology from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and after working at a National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) research center, she decided that a teaching job might best fit the needs of her family, especially since she had two small children. In 1968, she joined the faculty of a new community college.

She found the community college atmosphere of the late 1960s and early 1970s, with its freewheeling attitudes, returning Vietnam veterans, frontier spirit, and changing environment, much to her liking. Indeed, with encouragement from her students and a hands-off attitude from the administration, she began work on her Ph.D. in biology in 1974, completing it in 1981.

By the mid-1970s, the college had a change in administration, and a great deal of infighting was occurring between the division chairs and the president. The climate, while not hostile to scholarship, offered little incentive for her to engage in scholarly activities. But she continued, largely because of self-motivation.

By the time she was ready to complete her Ph.D. work, another change in administration took place. "The key word in the new administration was productivity. Classes became much larger. All relationships between the administration and faculty became adversarial. This nearly made it impossible for me to complete my dissertation." But she did complete it. She then received a postdoctoral fellowship for three consecutive summers to do research; she next took a two-year leave from her teaching position at the community college to serve as a postdoctoral fellow in the Atmospheric Sciences Division of NASA. The research was very rewarding, resulting in five published papers.

Upon her return to the community college, she found that the situation continued to deteriorate. "During this time faculty members who pursued professional interests outside of their normal teaching duties were harassed. . . . [A] faculty member who helped with theatrical productions for Colonial Williamsburg was investigated because he worked on plans in the drafting lab at the college. I certainly felt that it would be prudent to be very quiet about my professional activities outside the college. This period ended with the resignation of the president and the dean of instruction and a collective sigh of relief from the vast majority of the faculty."

A new president arrived on the scene and established "a new administration quite unlike any other that we had been exposed to. I can talk again. New ideas are encouraged. Faculty are no longer afraid."

What can be learned from her story? Without passing judgment on who was right or wrong in the many disputes that occurred on campus between the faculty and administrators, one can nevertheless conclude that the changing campus climate discouraged the pursuit of scholarship for this particular faculty member. More important, perhaps, is her belief that "research makes me an exciting, if exacting, teacher. In order to motivate students, instructors have to be excited themselves. This is not possible when teaching biology and microbiology time and time again for years. Scholarship is infectious and its pursuit should be encouraged by both top administrators as well as middle managers."

The faculty member adds a footnote: "If I had not been allowed the opportunity for graduate study and research, I probably would have left the community college long ago, or I would have found other outlets. Most faculty members appear to have found outside outlets. When these activities are non-academic, they often, I believe, reduce the overall contribution of these faculty members to the community college." Why should community college professionals engage in scholarship? The story of this faculty member answers the question extremely well.

Examples of Scholarly Activities

Recently, I reviewed the résumés of 110 community college faculty members in the humanities from the fifty-six colleges submitting grant applications in 1989 to the National Endowment for the Humanities. I was interested to learn what forms of scholarship this sample of humanities faculty had engaged in during their professional careers. While publications are only one form of scholarship (really, a manifestation of scholarship, regardless of the type of institution from which they emanate), they are nevertheless among the more visible examples of scholarship and they can be tallied (which is one reason why tenure committees cling to them). The results of my brief review are revealing.

Fifty-three of the 110 résumés included at least one publication; 3 of the 110 had had exhibits or public readings of their works. The published works ran the gamut from books to newspaper articles and included children's books, anthologies, short stories, and technical reports. Thirty-seven faculty had published articles in either national or local journals and 11 had published books, including textbooks; 21 of the 110 faculty members had published something in more than one category (for example, a journal article and a book). At least 6 had submitted manuscripts for publication but had not had anything published. At least 32 (some résumés did not include publication dates) had published something within the prior four-year period. In addition to the above scholarly activities, 27 of the 110 had presented papers at professional meetings, 18 had served as editor or contributing editor of a scholarly publication, and 8 had reviewed books for professional journals.

Community college humanities faculty, however, are perhaps more likely to write for publication than are other segments of the community college faculty, particularly those teaching in vocational-technical programs. Does this mean that scholarship, at least scholarly publications, is limited to the humanities faculty? No, not if one accepts a definition of scholarship that extends well beyond publishing in scholarly journals and writing books.

Another example of an outlet for scholarly analysis, and one that I believe has not been utilized effectively by most community college professionals, is the op-ed page of the Sunday newspaper. A good example of using the newspaper to promote a point of view based on practical experience and scholarly expertise is a series of articles on drug use in American society and on the role of the police officer, published in a Charlottesville, Virginia, newspaper by Brian C. Flick, a former lieutenant with the Harrison, New York, police department (he was the original officer in charge of the Jean Harris "Scarsdale Diet" doctor murder case) and now program chair and assistant professor of police science at Piedmont Virginia Community College. In one of two op-ed pieces, Flick noted that "everyone from President Bush to the man on the street has attempted to define the problem and offer a solution" to drug abuse in American society. Flick goes on to outline some of the difficulties in dealing with the drug problem and to offer his own solutions, most of which center on the need for local government action, especially the pooling of local resources. In the second article, he pointed to programs that have succeeded in combating drugs. In addition to these two op-ed articles on drugs, Flick wrote two articles on some of the misunderstandings that surround the police profession and how community college programs in police science can benefit police officers, such as by improving their image.

Are Flick's writings good examples of scholarship? Certainly not by traditional standards, although even here the lines are not as clearly drawn as they once were. In a letter to the editor of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Arlethia Perry (1990), director of media and external relations at Rutgers University, responded to an op-ed article by David Ignatius and examined the scholarly value of the piece from her perspective as an employee of a research university. Perry is, as she states, quick to "flatly disagree" with Ignatius that universities have come to regard the submission of opinion pieces as a form of academic publication. Perry (1990, p. B3) notes that "this could not be further from the truth. In fact, it is often difficult to convince faculty members to author opinion pieces . . . since they are by no means viewed by them or their peers as scholarly publication worthy of the time that it consumes." Perry, however, endorses faculty members writing op-ed pieces by noting that in their discussions of the oil spills that devastated the New York/New Jersey harbors in January and March 1990, "Rutgers faculty members wrote op-eds that were based on at least 10 years of research," thereby helping the media and the public to understand more fully the dangers of the spills. Finally, Perry believes that faculty members are writing serious articles that have the potential of advancing our understanding of the world: "They have merely expanded their reach beyond the academic journals—which the mass population rarely reads, if ever. From my perspective, faculty op-ed writers provide a needed public service by sharing the results of their research and scholarly endeavors and by providing thoughtful, informed analysis to the general public" (Perry, 1990, pp. B3-B4).

Back to the question about Flick's op-ed pieces, are they good examples of a type of scholarship that community college professionals should conduct? They are certainly valuable from Perry's perspective. They do not, however, pass the acid test applied to scholarship at most universities, including Perry's. They were not judged by a jury of his peers or even by the editor of a scholarly journal, nor were they published in a scholarly journal. Flick's articles were not based on traditional research; they did not even contain footnotes or references. Yet in the articles Flick bridged that broad chasm between practical experience and theory, a chasm that many traditional scholars do not have the practical experience or the inclination to bridge. One can argue, correctly I believe, that Flick's scholarship not only is legitimate but also represents a type that more community college professionals, indeed, more college and university faculty members at all levels, should endorse and practice. By bringing his own knowledge and experience to bear on problems facing society, Flick has used his professional status as a community college faculty member in a timely, useful, and sound manner, one that is compatible with the community college's commitment to solving community problems and compatible with the expanded definition of scholarship presented in this chapter.

Academic Deans and Scholarship

Attitudes toward scholarship among community college professionals may be changing. In a survey of eighty-six community college deans of instruction who were identified by their peers as leaders, the deans were asked to respond to four open-ended questions about scholarship and its place in community colleges. Sixty-three of the deans (73 percent) returned the survey. Given their educational leadership role on community college campuses (almost 67 percent of the deans surveyed described their principal role with regard to faculty as educational leader), the views of academic deans on scholarship provide some insight into how scholarship is currently viewed (and, perhaps, will be viewed in the future, assuming these deans remain in leadership positions) as well as how and why this viewpoint has developed.

When asked if they agreed with the statement, "Historically, community college professionals (faculty and administrators) have devoted little time to scholarship," fifty-eight of the sixty-one deans responding to the question answered affirmatively. Their responses as to why they agreed with the statement were varied, although several themes stood out: lack of time due to heavy teaching loads and limited support personnel, scholarship is not required, the newness of community colleges, the emphasis on community colleges as teaching institutions, and lack of rewards and training. Typical comments from different deans are as follows: "Heavy workloads with little assistance leaves very little time for 'scholarship.' Many of us are so busy 'doing it' that we don't have the time to 'write about it.' " "Focus is on delivery of instruction rather than augmenting the pool of knowledge." "Community college administrators more often come from a career field other than 'academia.' They are 'hands-on' teachers. . . . 'Scholar' and 'researcher' are newer roles."

The deans were then asked to respond to the following statement: " 'Based upon my own observations [the observations of the person making the statement], it seems to me as if there is a new awareness of the role scholarship can and should play in carrying out the community college mission.' If you agree with this statement, what is creating this new awareness?" Forty-nine of the sixty-three deans who returned the survey agreed with this statement. Several pointed to the maturing of community colleges as a reason. One dean wrote, "Community college professionals no longer have a sense of themselves as second-class citizens. There is now a sense of being full partners in the higher education enterprise, partners who have something to say to their colleagues" (Vaughan, 1990, p. 158). Another indicated that "leaders of the 1980s and 1990s have spent most, if not all, of their professional careers at community colleges. These educational leaders do not expect to 'move up' to four-year colleges. When they do research it will often be on what they know best: the community college" (Vaughan, 1990, p. 159). Others believe that research is needed so that institutional decision making is based on hard data rather than, as one dean put it, "[because] it just feels right."

Accountability, student outcomes, and the diversity of the student body also were mentioned as possible explanations for changes in attitude toward scholarship. For example, one dean wrote, "The changing curricula needs and student populations mandate a new awareness of the role scholarship can and should play in carrying out the community college mission. Increased emphases on assessment and accountability, increased demands for access and student support services, and a limited pool of resources dictate that community college leaders engage in greater degrees of research planning. That will necessitate greater involvement in scholarship."

Several deans did not believe that there is a new awareness of scholarship. One dean felt that "the role of scholarship will not, in my opinion, change to a significant extent without the infusion of new faculty." Another believed that those "in the four-year programs may be pushing this harder than are the masses in the community colleges." And, on a more positive note, one dean said that "there has been an awareness of the importance of scholarship on this campus since its beginning 62 years ago. I have observed it personally as [a] student and staff member for over 40 years."

How are deans promoting and honoring scholarship on their campuses? Some examples follow: "We have a mini-grant program that can be used for research activities and we have an office of research willing to help faculty with scholarly projects." "[We] founded an institute for educational research; supported a slick in-house magazine of faculty research (ongoing); provided released time for research projects which may benefit the college/classroom teaching, mission, understanding; feature faculty scholarship in meetings, in [the] library, in publications; value scholarly activities for promotion, sabbaticals, and tenure decisions—this has made a *big* difference; and value faculty who write, publish, get grants, present papers." "Positive feedback to such efforts; creating special programs that reinforce academic achievement; and encourage the idea of equal opportunity to become 'intellectually elite.' " "Scholars in residence program whereby funds [are] set aside for faculty [who are] reassigned time to write for publication."

Recommendations for the Future

The following recommendations are offered to help bring scholarship to the forefront of community college thinking and to introduce topics covered in the other chapters of this volume.

1. Each college should define scholarship and encourage faculty members and administrators to engage in scholarly activities that are in concert with the definition.

2. Community college faculty should seek and utilize a variety of outlets for their scholarship, including but also extending beyond the traditional. An important outlet for scholarly activities is the campus-produced journal, a number of which are currently being published by community colleges. As faculty members seek outlets for their scholarship, a word of caution is in order: They should not fall into the trap of seeing publications as the only outlet for their scholarly activities.

3. Faculty members and administrators should establish a campus climate that is conducive to and supportive of scholarly activities and that integrates scholarship into the institutional culture. For example, an annual ceremony honoring those faculty members who have engaged in scholarly activities during the year can quickly become a part of the institutional culture.

4. If scholarship is to become an important part of the professional lives of community college faculty members, it must be included as a part of the evaluation process.

The Future

What is the future of scholarship in the community college? It may be too early to tell, but based on some of the reports and activities referred to in this volume, it seems as if the community college may be at a turning point in its attitude toward scholarship. If this is true, the future for community college professionals entails changes, most of which will be for the best, I believe.

References

Johnson, G. W. "President's Annual Report to the Faculty of George Mason University." Address presented at George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, Sept. 12, 1990.

Perry, A. "A Defense of Academics Who Write for the Op-Ed Pages." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 2, 1990, pp. B3-B4.

Seidman, E. *In the Words of the Faculty: Perspectives on Improving Teaching and Educational Quality in Community Colleges.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Vaughan, G. B. *The Community College Presidency.* New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan, 1986.

Vaughan, G. B. "Scholarship in Community Colleges: The Path to Respect." *Educational Record,* 1988, *69* (2), 26-31.

Vaughan, G. B. "A New Wind 'A Blowing." *Community, Technical, and Junior College Times,* 1989a, *1* (13), 2.

Vaughan, G. B. *Leadership in Transition: The Community College Presidency.* New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan, 1989b.

Vaughan, G. B. *Scholarship: The Community College's Achilles' Heel.* Occasional Paper No. 1. Weyers Cave: Research and Publications Commission, Virginia Community Colleges Association, 1989c. 22 pp. (ED 313 081)

Vaughan, G. B. *Pathway to the Presidency: Community College Deans of Instruction.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1990. 228 pp. (ED 318 526)

George B. Vaughan is professor of higher education at the University of Florida, Gainesville.

Community colleges have developed a culture that is increasingly out of step with the orientation of their faculties, and this dissonance has limited their ability to respond to the changing needs of their communities, students, faculties, and society as a whole.

False Dichotomies

Jonathan Block

The debate over the role of scholarship in the teaching profession is not new. Alfred North Whitehead (1929, p. 7) spoke eloquently about the need for the academy to resist becoming ensnared in false dichotomies and identified the central problem of all education as "keeping knowledge alive, of preventing it from becoming inert." He went on to say that "the antithesis between a technical and a liberal education is fallacious. There can be no adequate technical education which is not liberal and no liberal education which is not technical: that is, education which does not impart both technique and intellectual vision. In simple language, education should turn out the student with something he knows well and something he can do well—the ultimate union of practice and theory" (p. 74).

The comprehensive community college merged the divergent ethics of vocational-technical institutes and junior colleges to create what is perhaps the most important innovation in higher education since the establishment of land grant colleges and universities in the nineteenth century. This marriage of technical training and lower-division baccalaureate work has, however, fostered a conflict that threatens our collective future. Scholarship is at the root of this conflict.

Roots in the Public Schools

The origins of the false dichotomy between teaching and scholarship are found, at least partially, in the backgrounds of the founding presidents and faculties of community and junior colleges. Many of these early educators were drawn from the ranks of common school superintendents, secondary school teachers, and vocational instructors. Vaughan (1986, pp. 28-29) reports that in 1960 over 35 percent of public junior college presidents came

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES, no. 76, Winter 1991 © Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers

from positions in public school administration; in 1970 this figure had dropped to a little over 13 percent, and by 1985 the figure had declined to just over 7 percent. Many of the early presidents did not have training as scholars, and of those who held doctorates (75 percent in Vaughan's study), most had studied education or educational administration (p. 19). Scholarship was not considered an important factor in selecting community college leaders. As Vaughan explains, "The lowest ranking skill or ability for both the successful president and for subordinates is the ability to produce scholarly publication" (p. 188). He concludes that "the leading presidents consider producing scholarly publications an even lower priority for subordinates than for themselves. This situation . . . indicates that scholarly analysis resulting in publications is unlikely to be more important for community college leadership in the future than it is at the present" (p. 193).

A similar profile could be drawn of the faculty. Many of the faculty who were hired by community colleges during the extraordinary growth period of the 1960s came to their positions from the public schools. As products of a certification-based terminal education, these core faculty, selected on the basis of their preparation and accomplishments as teachers, were both unprepared and unwilling to accept a commitment to disciplinary or pedagogical scholarship as a central component of their new roles.

With the close ties to the schools came an emphasis on teaching. Community college systems began, at least for the purposes of funding and governance, as extensions of the K-12 school system and "from the start . . . were defined as teaching institutions and not as research institutions" (Parilla, 1986, p. 1). As the movement exploded and community college leaders sought to carve out a distinctive niche within the higher education establishment, they continued to emphasize teaching rather than research. Unfortunately, some falsely assumed that the affirmation of teaching meant the renunciation of scholarship.

It can be argued that the single-minded focus on teaching, and the exclusion of scholarship, contributed to the early successes of the community college. Faculty identified with their institutions and devoted their efforts to advancing their students. But these successes were achieved at a cost. Schwab (1969, p. 18) calls our attention to the dilemma inherent to this tunnel vision: "The faculty have no professional lives apart from their teaching. They make no music. They write no books. They uncover no new knowledge. They forge no policies. They are not conspicuously engaged in honorable public service. They administer little apart from their homes and classrooms. They teach, to be sure, but their teaching is a full time service they perform, not a flowering or sharing of expertise or scholarship."

Faculty Perspectives and Cultural Dissonance

As community colleges continued to grow during the late 1960s, two forces combined to dramatically alter the makeup of the faculty. The increased output of Ph.D. holders, along with a declining demand for new faculty in four-year institutions and research universities, presented community colleges with a cohort of potential faculty who combined a desire to teach with a grounding in scholarship. This came at a time when the demand for new faculty in two-year colleges was ballooning. New faculty were drawn increasingly from college and university graduate programs, where they had been indoctrinated in a research-oriented culture that emphasized scholarship and often viewed teaching, especially undergraduate teaching, as a second-class activity.

It should come as no surprise that the move to the community college subjected many faculty to what O'Banion (1972) has identified as "transfer shock." Asked why they entered academics, nearly all of the respondents in Ruscio's (1985, p. 41) study gave the same answer: "Lured primarily by interest in a particular subject, and inspired by a teacher of that subject, they sought an opportunity to continue learning about that field. . . . Once in graduate school, the individual, looking for a further opportunity to continue studying the subject, saw an academic profession as the most inviting." Yet ties to the discipline are tenuous at the community college. As Cohen and Brawer (1972, p. 51) point out:

> One of the greatest hindrances to identity for the junior college instructor results from his straddling his role as he would balance a teeter-totter. He rocks between the high school teacher on one end and the college professor on the other. He may consider himself a disciplinarian—an anthropologist, a historian, or a psychologist—yet feel separate from his university compatriots. Nevertheless, he frequently identifies with his own subject matter rather than with instructors of similar ages or of comparable orientation to the discipline of instruction.

Community colleges have attempted to avoid this clash between faculty members' discipline-centered orientation and the institution's focus on teaching by requiring prospective faculty and administrators to "understand and appreciate the role and mission of the comprehensive community college," a phrase found in most junior college position announcements. Community colleges have thus sought to sidestep a commitment to scholarship through affirmation of a limited mission. But in the process they have been denying a central component of the academic culture. As Shils (1983, p. 104) points out, "The fundamental obligations of [faculty] for teaching, research, and academic citizenship are the same for all academics. . . . To abstain from any of these totally and to show no respect for them is contrary to the obligations of an academic career."

The result of these efforts to emphasize teaching at the expense of scholarship is often a frustrated faculty, at odds with the institutions that they serve. Siehr (1963) and Garrison (1967) both identified "lack of time for scholarly study" as the most frequently mentioned problem confronting community college faculty. Cohen and Brawer (1972, p. 51) similarly state that "the prospective teacher who hopes for intellectual pursuits should heed such warnings. He might similarly anticipate other problems cited by faculty members: the ambiguous nature of the junior college as simultaneously a public school and a segment of higher education; the inflexibility of colleagues who reflect 'the Standard Academic Mind' in their concern with courses and degrees . . . [and] the lack of scholarly interchange with fellow faculty members."

Isolation from the Discipline

Cultural dissonance within the institution is not the only result of the rejection of scholarship, and faculty are not the only victims. Students, those whom we are committed to serve, also suffer. Pederson (1989, p. 5) states the problem succinctly: "The failure of most community colleges to embrace an institutional value system which supports discipline-based research has cut the institution off from the dynamic quality of the disciplines and the larger intellectual culture. The effect of this isolation on community college faculty has been profound. More importantly [this failure] has created two separate and unequal classes of undergraduate student."

Community colleges are young institutions with close horizons. Educators at these institutions pride themselves on being responsive to student needs and interests and wrap themselves in the twin banners of opportunity and access. They promise their students not only a supportive learning environment but also curricula that can enable them to enrich their intellectual and vocational vocabularies and advance them toward new occupational and educational experiences. Community college catalogues trumpet responsive curricula derived from extensive use of community advisory boards and faculties staffed by "practical experts" with actual experience in the subjects that they teach. Sensitive to the accusation that "those who can, do, while those who can't, teach," community colleges pride themselves on employing practitioners as faculty.

But the goal of maintaining faculties who are current in their disciplines is frustrated by the hostile view toward scholarship adopted by many community colleges. While it may once have been true that knowledge of a subject coupled with pedagogical skills qualified one for a lifetime of teaching, this is certainly not the case today. The apprenticeship system, rooted in the medieval guilds, served to prepare both shoemakers and scribes in an age when the universe of knowledge and technology advanced incrementally from generation to generation. We live today, however, in an age when even the most basic jobs are revolutionized by technology every few years. Lifelong learning is not a luxury; it is essential, not only for workers in factories and offices but also for teachers in our higher education institutions.

The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988, p. 11) draws attention to the crisis confronting junior college faculties:

> Community college faculty members, especially in career and technical programs, often do not have the support they need to keep abreast of their profession. Many feel isolated—out of touch with colleagues in their fields. We find it especially disturbing that 63 percent of the community college faculty in a national survey rated the intellectual environment at their institution as "fair" or "poor." In a climate such as this, teaching effectiveness is diminished and the potential for excellence is lost.

The commission goes on to note the importance of the community college task of preparing students for transfer to four-year schools. "We urgently recommend that the transfer function of the community college be strengthened" (p. 37). Successful program articulation requires that both the content and the quality of instruction delivered to students be equivalent to what is provided at the senior institutions.

The Basics

The "basics" are changing in every discipline, from electronics to history. If community colleges are to fulfill their promise as colleges of opportunity, they must commit themselves to the ongoing intellectual growth of their faculty. A colleague in the American Council on Education Fellows Program, Estelle Resnik, shared with me the following true story, which illustrates the intellectual stagnation that can result when faculty members fail to keep up with their disciplines: "At one community college, the . . . only faculty member [qualified in electronics] was asked to develop a course in electronics fundamentals. The text he chose was twenty years old. When his choice was challenged by the dean, he responded, 'The course is called "Fundamentals of Electronics." That means basics. That means they don't change' " (personal communication, Estelle Resnik, Jan. 29, 1990).

Community college faculty in any discipline, from merchandising to English, to sociology, are selected not only on the basis of their teaching skills but also on their currency in their respective disciplines. They bring two crafts to the classroom: teaching and scholarship within the discipline. Community college faculty delude themselves if they suggest that the disciplines are static and that scholarship is an attribute that, once acquired, does not require constant nurturing. Boyer (1987) makes the case for the importance of recognizing teachers who stay abreast of their professions and draws an important distinction between "publishing researchers" and "first-rate scholars." It may indeed be inappropriate for community colleges to require active publication by their faculty. Nevertheless, community college leaders must recognize, encourage, and reward scholarship.

The New Student

Environmental change is not restricted to the curriculum. The demographics of the student population are also shifting, and higher education is now struggling to meet the needs of what has been called the "new majority." Community colleges, which have always opened their doors to nontraditional students, are taking a leadership role in meeting this challenge.

Community college students are not merely older than traditional students. Women, first-generation students, minorities, immigrants, and reverse transfers are flocking to community colleges, bringing to these institutions a wealth of experience from outside of the classroom. The real-world experiences of the students contribute to the richness of the educational experience at the community college. At the same time, these students place special demands on faculty. Eager to reap the fruits of educational opportunity, the new majority is a critical audience, not easily satisfied with general responses to specific problems. Faculty must be able to link pedagogy to current practice; this ability requires faculty to critically analyze their disciplines within the context of contemporary society.

The new generation of students gauges the quality of learning against personal experiences and demands that instructors provide depth as well as breadth. These students do not seek the easiest path to certification or the least demanding curriculum. In order to attend college, they make significant personal commitments and sacrifices, in terms of both time and money, and their expectations are appropriately high. Many bring substantial knowledge, skills, and prior accomplishments to the classroom, and they judge the quality of their experience pragmatically in terms of value-added benefits. These students place a high value on education and its potential benefit to their lives. To be effective, faculty must place a similar value on scholarship in their personal and professional lives.

Community colleges are viewed by some as quintessential "postgraduate" institutions, because their students are, regardless of age, "returning students." This broad category of students includes such individuals as high school graduates who had originally thought a diploma sufficient to meet their needs, medical professionals seeking continued certification, displaced workers, and homemakers. They are not simply seeking to advance through grades thirteen and fourteen; rather, they enroll out of a desire to build on already established foundations. These students have made a commitment to continuing education for themselves, and they expect no less from the faculty.

Pluralism

"Pluralism" is replacing "diversity" as a social and institutional value. America is discarding the melting pot, realizing instead that the nation's future lies in celebrating the uniqueness of its diverse populations. The implications for community colleges are manifold and must be addressed in the classroom. It is not sufficient to increase the diversity of faculty or to add courses at the periphery of the curriculum. Rather, faculty must broaden their understanding of their disciplines and develop ways of integrating, interpreting, and presenting the content of their courses within the context of society's evolving awareness of pluralism. Meaningful educational opportunities derive from curricula that affirm diversity, acknowledge individual uniqueness, and bridge, rather than deny, differences.

General Education

Because time is at a premium for today's students, they rightfully expect efficiency in presentation as well as quality in content. These are students who enroll in specific classes with clear expectations. In order to meet those expectations, faculty must remain current in their disciplines and have the skills required to convey their expertise to students. The course-specific focus of today's student places an additional burden on community college faculty. Committed to education of the whole person and to provision of a broadening and liberalizing intellectual experience, faculty are challenged to infuse all of their courses with broadly applicable, general educational content.

While it may once have been appropriate for teachers to present narrowly developed syllabi, confident that gaps would be filled out through general education electives, there is a new realization that general education must be a part of each course in the curriculum. Programs abound in writing, thinking, and computing across the curriculum, and more are being introduced each year. The largest obstacle to the success of these programs lies not in student preparedness but rather in faculty unwillingness or inability to accept institutionwide responsibility for basic education in every course. To meet students' expectations, as well as their needs, it is not sufficient to simply offer them the basics of a generation ago. Today's students expect and are entitled to more. If faculty are to promote the basic values of scholarship in every course, community colleges must encourage their continued intellectual growth and scholarly activity.

Community Service

A distinctive characteristic of comprehensive community colleges is their commitment to serve the broad educational and cultural needs of their service districts. Delivery of instruction is by no means the exclusive medium for fulfilling this obligation. Community colleges respond to a universe of community needs, from business assistance to cultural programming. They house concert halls, art galleries, small business development centers, and technology transfer centers. In many locations, the community college has replaced the high school or the town hall as the primary venue for community gatherings. Like the research universities, community colleges are expected to provide current expertise in a range of issues confronting their communities. In a world where change is the norm, where the information explosion threatens to overwhelm the individual's ability to cope, our faculty must be equipped to explain and translate the "state of the art."

Conclusions and Recommendations

While the need to establish or renew the role of scholarship in community colleges is clear, all the indicators are not negative. In spite of the high level of concern within community colleges about the intellectual environment, the U.S. Department of Education's 1988 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty revealed that community college faculty were more likely than faculty at four-year colleges to express satisfaction with their work, with the reputations of their institutions, with their salaries, and with the required mix of teaching, service, and research ("Fact File . . . ," 1990). This satisfaction speaks well for morale at two-year institutions, especially when we consider that their faculties are generally paid less than the faculties at most four-year institutions.

However, community college leaders should be concerned with other findings in the survey revealing that their faculties spend only 3 percent of their time on research activities and that less than 25 percent report outside income from consulting. These data raise the specter of complacency, as do the findings that 87 percent of the community college faculty were tenured and that community colleges lag behind other institutions in implementation of policies aimed at reducing the proportion of faculty who hold tenure. These trends emphasize the importance of attending to the professional renewal of faculty; in the academy the key to professional renewal is self-renewal through continued scholarly activity.

Community colleges are not alone in struggling with the false dichotomy between teaching and research. America's research universities are victimized by the flip side of the same coin. While community colleges seek to adjust their culture to support and encourage the scholarly lives of the faculty, many four-year colleges and universities are struggling to reassert teaching as a central obligation of faculty and to reexamine their views of scholarship. In a keynote address to the American Association for Higher Education, Ernest Boyer (1990) called on all of higher education to recognize and affirm the scholarship inherent to the integration, application, and presentation of knowledge, as well as the scholarship inherent to the discovery of new knowledge.

Community colleges, leaders in innovation in higher education for the last thirty years, are better situated to respond to this challenge than are four-year colleges and graduate institutions. While community colleges have neglected scholarship, many four-year colleges and research universities have treated undergraduate teaching as a necessary evil, a purgatory for deadwood and junior faculty. They reward their most respected scholars by reducing their teaching loads to increase research opportunities, thus transforming the call to educate into an obligation of the academic underclass. The integration, application, and presentation of knowledge are considered, in many research universities, to be lower-order activities that are unbecoming to the true scholar.

Nonetheless, the false dichotomy between teaching and scholarship continues to haunt community colleges and poses an unquestionable threat to their ability to provide meaningful opportunities to their communities, their students, and their faculty in the future. The challenge facing community college leaders at all levels is to broaden their vision and to recognize the centrality of scholarship to the realization of the distinctive mission of their institutions. Several practical steps can be taken to strengthen the position of scholarship within the community college:

1. Review mission statements to ensure that support for scholarship is incorporated in the basic purposes of community and junior colleges.
2. Review criteria for faculty evaluation, making sure that ongoing scholarly activity and intellectual growth are expected of all members of the academic community.
3. Educate governing boards about the importance of hiring presidents who seek "a commitment to scholarship."
4. Include commitment to scholarship and scholarly activity as one of the qualifications for academic leadership at the level of department chair, division head, and dean.
5. Articulate institutionally appropriate definitions of scholarship and recognize faculty excellence in scholarship as well as in teaching.
6. Support the scholarly development of faculty through minigrants, released time, and sabbaticals.
7. Encourage faculty to write and publish by providing clerical support and orientation to outlets for their work and the protocol of publication.
8. Submit faculty work to the Educational Resources Information Center and other information clearinghouses for dissemination.
9. Encourage faculty to work with colleagues in schools and research universities when seeking extramural support for scholarly activity.
10. Recognize and publicize the scholarly accomplishments of faculty.

Community and junior colleges have responded to various challenges throughout their brief history. When community colleges accept the comprehensive obligations of educational institutions committed to access, opportunity, and excellence, they enhance not only the quality of the institutions but also the opportunities that they afford their students. To be effective educators, to realize the promise of opportunity (as well as access) for all students, it is imperative that community and junior colleges affirm their place in the community of scholars. The time has come to denounce the false dichotomy between teaching and scholarship and to assert the inherent value of critical study for all citizens. The affirmation of scholarship empowers both faculty and students to realize their full potential.

References

Boyer, E. L. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America.* New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

Boyer, E. L. "The New American Scholar." Keynote address at the National Conference on Higher Education of the American Association for Higher Education, San Francisco, April 1990.

Cohen, A. M., and Brawer, F. B. *Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1972.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1988. 58 pp. (ED 293 578)

"Fact File: Faculty Attitudes, Workload, and Earnings, Fall 1987." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 7, 1990, p. A16.

Garrison, R. *Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1967. 99 pp. (ED 012 177)

O'Banion, T. *Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior Colleges.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1972.

Parilla, R. E. *Gladly Would They Learn and Gladly Teach.* Southern Association of Community and Junior Colleges Occasional Papers, vol. 4, no. 1. Charlottesville, Va.: Southern Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1986. 6 pp. (ED 263 949)

Pederson, R. "The Community College Instructor as Professional." *Community College Week,* June 5, 1989, p. 5.

Ruscio, K. P. *Many Sectors, Many Professions.* Comparative Higher Education Research Group Working Paper, no. 7. Los Angeles: Graduate School of Education, University of California, 1985. 69 pp. (ED 265 796)

Schwab, J. J. *College Curriculum and Student Protest.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Shils, D. E. *The Academic Ethic.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Siehr, H. *Problems of New Faculty Members in Community Colleges.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1963. 80 pp. (ED 013 093)

Vaughan, G. B. *The Community College Presidency.* New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan, 1986.

Whitehead, A. N. *The Aims of Education and Other Essays.* New York: Macmillan, 1929.

Jonathan Block is American Council on Education Fellow at Washington State University, Pullman. He served previously as assistant to the president at Parkland College, Champaign, Illinois.

It is time for community college presidents to affirm the concept of "scholar-professor" on their campuses.

Scholarship in the Community College: A President's Perspective

Robert E. Parilla

Community colleges function as the safety net of higher education. With faculties dedicated to teaching, these institutions are open to all and work assiduously to serve the needs of the surrounding communities. They represent the last and best hope for those with only a tenuous hold on the American Dream. Into our classrooms troop nearly half of the minorities now in higher education; 43 percent of African Americans and 55 percent of Hispanics in college are at two-year institutions (Green, 1989, p. 3). Community colleges also open the educational system to low-income and marginally prepared students. As Cross (1989, p. 8) notes, "Every so-called non-traditional segment that was under-represented in 1950 is over-represented in community colleges today."

Retention of these students is a major concern. Often they experience great difficulty with the traditional college curriculum because their prior schooling leaves them with low self-esteem and inadequately developed skills (Valverde, 1985, p. 86). Community college presidents must provide the moral and intellectual leadership needed to create the vibrant, stimulating learning environments needed by those who might otherwise be lost to higher education. Faculty are the crucial element, especially for the diverse range of students in introductory courses. I believe that scholarship, the link that energizes the teacher-learner relationship, as well as the college experience generally, must be at the heart of efforts to revitalize the academic environment.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES, no. 76, Winter 1991 © Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers

The Distinction Between Scholarship and Research

Few would argue that one of the abiding strengths of the community college is the dedication and professionalism of the faculty. These individuals form the front line of instruction, support, and direction for a heterogeneous student body. Despite their vital role, however, community college faculty are often isolated, even stigmatized, by their counterparts at four-year colleges because the work of the community college instructor centers on teaching, with little or no emphasis on scholarship. Basic research has been relegated to the university. As a result, community colleges have come close to insulating the craft of teaching from the scholarship that nourishes it. They have come to be identified, in particular, as "teaching" institutions, with the implication that research is irrelevant to teaching.

The gradual insulation of teaching from scholarship is partly the result of confusion about what constitutes scholarship. Scholarship is not the same as basic research. This distinction needs to be understood if community colleges are to encourage faculty to engage in active scholarship. Indeed, if we examine the concept of scholarship and differentiate it from research, it becomes clear that scholarship is an indispensable adjunct to teaching. As such, it can become a valuable part of the professional lives of community college faculty.

Cowley (1950) provides a useful discussion of the different, though related, natures of research and scholarship. He defines research as "the effort to discover new facts or long forgotten facts. It is the empirical element in the quest for understanding the nature of the universe and man" (p. 1). Scholarship, on the other hand, is "the organization, criticism and interpretation of facts, and thoughts of facts; it is the rationalistic element in the pursuit of understanding" (p. 1).

In another attempt to distinguish the two activities, Carter (1980, p. 93) observes that "research has moved away from its original meaning of the process of discovering new knowledge and has come to encompass the many things pursued by faculty and institutions besides teaching." Scholarship is included on this list, as is consulting, criticism, artistic creation, and theory testing. Carter suggests that if we substituted *scholarship* as a necessary adjunct of teaching for the imprecise word *research*, the consequences would be substantial: Time and resources would be available to encourage faculty to become "genuinely learned" (p. 97). More recently, Vaughan (1988, p. 27) made a slightly different distinction between the two functions, noting that scholarship is "the systematic pursuit of a topic, an objective rational inquiry that involves critical analysis." He places research as an activity within scholarship, while Carter lists scholarship under the umbrella of research.

Semantics aside, the critical issue is that faculty must be actively involved in their disciplines or technical fields in order to be effective teachers. Active involvement, however, does not necessarily require pursuit of original basic research. I believe that scholarship includes the broad scope of activities outlined in Cowley's definition and also encompasses the need for faculty in career programs to keep pace with today's rapidly changing technology. Criticism, artistic creation, synthesis of facts, and experimentation with new ways of teaching are examples of scholarship that can enrich the faculty member's professional life.

However, calls for the integration of scholarship and teaching fly in the face of longstanding tradition. Early junior college leaders consistently reminded faculty that teaching and accessibility to students were their highest priorities (Seidman, 1985, p. 12). A student-centered ethos has become the hallmark of the community college (O'Banion, 1972, p. 23). These principles should not be abandoned, but neither should they preclude a commitment to scholarship. It is essential to revitalize that symbiotic relationship between scholarship and effective teaching. This effort requires leadership from both community college administrators and faculty, with the president creating a vision and communicating it to others. The enthusiasm and commitment of the president can produce the essential energy required to effect the necessary institutional change.

Community college faculty bear a heavy burden imposed by the need for remedial work as well as by the need to meet shifting consumer demands (Clark, 1987, p. 88). The most daunting task faced by the president, therefore, is to regenerate within faculty the love of their disciplines or career fields that led them to teach in the first place. I believe that the president can transform and invigorate the entire instructional program by promoting and valuing the practice of scholarship among faculty. But a great deal of history will have to be overcome to accomplish this goal.

Historical Background

Scholarship and research did not become an integral part of higher education in this country until the establishment of universities, which were patterned after German institutions. The German universities had become famous for their success in joining teaching with research. It was under the influence of the German model that university presidents such as Daniel Coit Gilman at Johns Hopkins, Charles William Eliot at Harvard, and Granville Stanley Hall at Clark established the first American graduate schools.

In 1876, Johns Hopkins University fused the roles of teaching and research, and a new career was born: the university professor (Baker, 1986, p. 54). Universities began to be seen as centers for the production of knowledge, not as teaching institutions. As William Rainey Harper, the first president of the University of Chicago, expressed in 1905, the "crowning function of a university is original research"; this means that "it is not enough that instructors . . . should merely do the class and lecture work

Present Status of Faculty at Community Colleges

The need to revitalize faculty is emerging as a major theme in community college education. Cross (1990) predicts that faculty quality will be a priority issue for higher education in the 1990s. "Faculty," she reminds us, "constitute the spine of higher education." As another example, two recent reports issued by the National Science Foundation (1988, 1989) specifically target the need for faculty revitalization at the two-year college. The first, *Science and Engineering Education in Two-Year Colleges*, stresses faculty ties to their disciplines as a key element of educational improvement: "Limited professional development opportunities, heavy teaching loads, and a lack of scholarly tradition keep many two-year college faculty in isolation from the mainstream of their discipline" (National Science Foundation, 1988, p. 11). The second, *Report on the National Science Foundation Workshop on Science, Engineering, and Mathematics Education in Two-Year Colleges*, endorses the "teacher-scholar" as a specific recommendation (National Science Foundation, 1989). Presidents must call attention to reports such as these and lead boards, deans, and faculty in efforts to come up with solutions that help faculty return to the mainstreams of their disciplines while maintaining their commitment to teaching.

Most of the faculty currently teaching at community colleges were hired during the growth years of the 1960s and early 1970s. They are now middle-aged and coming to grips with some of the life-cycle problems of their profession. In the words of a higher education research report on faculty development, "Faculty soon catch on to the fundamentally unchanging nature of their work. With the exception of special projects, what a faculty member does one year is pretty much what he or she will do the next year, and the year after, and the year after. This lack of variety tends to cause teaching to become more and more enervating. As the years go by, faculty members mature physically, psychologically, and in terms of their philosophy and technique. But the essential sameness of their lives remains" (Brookes and German, 1983, p. 19).

Faculty burnout is a direct consequence of these conditions. Chief among the pressures cited by instructors is the lack of time to keep up with their disciplines. Community college faculty enjoy few opportunities to participate in professional activities that keep them informed of new developments in their fields. In the early 1970s, Kellams (1974, p. 12) noted that community college faculty have fewer sabbaticals and are less likely to travel to conferences or engage in professional activities. I suspect that with current budget pressures, community college faculty have become even more divorced from traditional academic supports. Clark (1987, p. 87) points out that community college institutional mandates such as heavy class loads and the need to serve a diverse population completely overshadow disciplinary incentives.

The overriding message transmitted to community college faculty for decades is that teaching is their primary function and that research or other scholarly pursuits should defer to the need for student interaction and instructional excellence. However, as Vaughan (1988, p. 29) reminds us, "Teaching without scholarship is the brokering of information; it is not the providing of intellectual leadership." To separate teaching from scholarship is to deny that teaching is at root a vigorous intellectual exercise. Seidman (1985, p. 254) views this separation as a value-laden dichotomy. To foster excellence in an institution of higher education, it is critical to stimulate faculty vitality and support their self-esteem.

Many community college students are not independent learners; thus, the quality of their education depends heavily on the instructional experiences provided by faculty. Baldwin and Krotseng (1985, p. 11) note that although salary and work environment are important issues, "colleges and universities must [also] provide conditions that give faculty members a sense of purpose and growth." One method of improving faculty satisfaction and morale is to encourage scholarly activity. Teaching, a people business, is perceived as having a lower status than the research activities of university professors. These perceptions lower the self-esteem of community college faculty and lead to the characterization of teaching as a nonintellectual activity that is unrelated to the life of the mind (Seidman, 1985, p. 262). Faculty who perceive themselves as "scholar-professors" have more positive self-images. If faculty have greater self-esteem, their energy can be a source of inspiration and encouragement for students, and the entire instructional program will benefit.

The classical notion of the scholar-professor has never been embraced within the community college ethic. Leadership for such a substantial change of values and priorities must come from the presidents themselves. Faculty remain the crucial element in the process of achieving the unique mission of the community college. It is therefore essential for those in leadership positions to stimulate faculty growth and enthusiasm. Historically, college and university presidents have defined and characterized the nature of American higher education; community college presidents must now continue this tradition. It is time to embrace scholarship on two-year campuses and to make it a permanent component of teaching excellence.

Strengthening the Link Between Scholarship and Teaching

Teaching, a basic human process, is as old as time. We in education have merely formalized an instinct that exists in all cultures and, in fact, assures a culture's survival by disseminating information from one generation to the next (Parilla, 1989, p. 1). The faculty and the president share this responsibility. The president needs to be informed of current educational issues and to help inform the faculty of the institution's strengths and weaknesses. The president's role is to communicate and convince faculty of the need to place more emphasis on scholarship. The president is the enabler of change, the faculty are its agents.

Critics of the current educational scene often charge that one of the problems with modern education is that it is not modern. The lecture method is still the overwhelming choice of professors. The traditional classroom format has changed little from the classical model that grew from ancient roots. Rather than disparage this familiar model, I suggest strengthening the role of the teacher as "The One Who Knows" by encouraging faculty to embrace the notion of lifelong learning through scholarship. Certainly, worlds of adjunct and supplementary tools can enhance and enliven the teacher-learner experience. However, when searching for the most effective vehicle of transmitting information, it becomes apparent that a thoughtful, knowledgeable, and inspiring teacher is the source of choice.

The interaction between teacher and learner is crucial; at the heart of this interaction is the quality and knowledge that teachers possess of both content and process. As Boyer (1987, p. 131) states, "Scholarship is not on an esoteric appendage, it is at the heart of what the [teaching] profession is all about." Oromaner (1986, p. 2) takes a similar track, noting that although teaching is not necessary to successful scholarship, some form of scholarship is a necessary condition of sustained, effective teaching. He further suggests that the current stress on teaching without scholarship in the community college actually may have brought about a decline in the quality of teaching. Boyer (1990) notes the irony that while American society continues to place ever-expanding expectations on higher education, the rules for scholarship have been narrowing, and faculty have been rewarded almost exclusively for nonclassroom pursuits. He proposes a broadly based definition of scholarship that includes teaching as a component.

Community college presidents can begin to effect needed reforms by finding ways to reward teaching scholars. An institution of learning is sustained and nourished by individual acts of creativity, and creativity does not flow without stimuli. Policy, planning, or mandate will not suffice. Presidential example and emphasis are needed to develop individual administrators who are themselves scholars. Through advocacy of scholarship, new values can become part of the institution's culture. An institution with innovative, scholarship-oriented leaders achieves an energized and adaptive style that ultimately empowers faculty and encourages personal and professional growth. Thus nurtured, scholarship becomes an integral part of professional life, embraced by faculty as indispensable to their teaching. In such a climate, "One can envision teaching and research as a marriage that works" (Baker, 1986, p. 50). I would substitute "scholarship" for "research," but the metaphor is a strikingly effective image for the positive, interdependent relationship that can exist between educational excellence and scholarship.

Building a Program for Faculty Scholarship

Cohen and Friedlander (1980) reported that, given the opportunity, 61 percent of community college faculty in their sample would spend more time engaged in scholarly pursuits. That figure likely is higher today. Faculty turnover during the 1980s has been relatively low at community colleges, and the aging and burnout of faculty members remains a real concern. Vitality in a college implies enthusiasm, curiosity, creativity, continuous professional growth, and good teaching. Scholarship is the driving force for this vitality.

To be successful, a program of scholarly activities for community college faculty must be perceived as an opportunity, not as an added responsibility. Preaching to faculty about the rewards of scholarship is futile if faculty do not consider scholarship an integral part of their work. By keying into the intrinsic rewards of academic life—which derive from a love of knowledge—institutional leaders can keep faculty involved and professionally alive by facilitating scholarly activity and encouraging student-faculty relationships. Presidents should be careful, however, that their support for scholarship does not result in bureaucratic procedures that suffocate creativity or faculty enthusiasm. An ideal program focuses on scholarly *process* as well as *outcome*. Faculty members should be encouraged to follow their own professional interests. The president must make it clear that the program belongs to the faculty. He or she must also insist that the program be broadly interpreted and remain as flexible as possible. Administrators need to facilitate the program as a true faculty development effort, not as a tool for administrative initiatives.

An institutional commitment to scholarship can be achieved in several ways. One model provides a direct subsidy for scholarly activities in the faculty members' teaching disciplines. Such programs provide reassigned faculty time for a variety of activities, including the following: research for an article or paper; participation in performing arts activities; participation in work experience directly related to teaching; creation of artistic work; volunteer consulting or internships; holding of an office in a discipline-related professional organization; preparation of a work of scholarly opinion or synthesis; and updates of teaching, professional, or technical program competence through development of a current "best-practice" bibliography. These activities stimulate the mind and nourish professional competence.

This model works best within broad parameters. If scholarly activity does not result in a product, a one-page abstract describing the project and its result is usually sufficient as a reporting requirement. These abstracts can then be shared widely within the college to encourage others. External dissemination of the scholarly products should be left to the individual faculty member.

Other methods of fostering scholarship include instituting a scholar-in-residence program, developing a faculty lecture series, and encouraging publication in scholarly journals. Cross and Angelo (1989, p. 24) suggest that community college faculty should become classroom researchers, using individual classrooms as laboratories to discover ways to improve learning. Whichever avenues are pursued, the momentum must begin with the college president. Through clear personal commitment, the president can signal the need for a new institutional climate that supports scholarship.

Role of the President: Personal and Professional

Change comes to individuals only with great personal determination. The task of changing an institution is even more difficult. Thus, if scholarship is to become an integral part of the professional lives of community college faculty members and administrators, the thrust and commitment must originate with the president.

The value of scholarship is asserted by a presidential leadership style founded on behaviors that can be generalized throughout the organization. It should be clear throughout the community college that the decision-making processes of the institution are informed by a scholarly approach to management. Management decisions should not be mysterious or whimsical. Rather, they should be clearly based on a rationale that is carefully constructed by reference to relevant research, reading, and discussion. Decisions made during emergencies may be intuitive, but the general administrative processes that direct the college should be seen to flow from informed practice rather than from intuition.

By sharing this process with the whole institution, the president can demonstrate that individual management styles, like academic disciplines, are based on a rational understanding of people and current research. Decisions that appear to be made on an ad hoc basis can in fact be shown to originate from an incrementally constructed foundation of information and ideas. By disseminating materials and encouraging an ongoing exchange of information, the president can stimulate discussion and build a dynamic forum for ideas. For example, when I introduced an internal reorganization plan to my college community last year, I was anxious to communicate not only my plan but also the management theories and intensive reading on which it was based. The sharing of articles, books, columns, case studies, and other readings communicates a respect for and reliance on scholarship to administrators, faculty, and staff.

Numerous strategies can be used to increase the number of scholar-professors among us. The most important, however, is for the president to identify ways to motivate faculty without further burdening them. Knodt (1988, p. 172), suggests alternative scheduling, variable course loads, funding from alumni, and even government grants as ways that institutions with tight budgets can support scholarship. The president must solicit support from the college board of trustees. Scholarship activities need to be funded in the budget and included in collegewide professional development objectives. This funding may require a change in college priorities. A reordering of institutional priorities is never easy, but it is surely impossible unless the president garners the power and resources for implementation.

Conclusion

The president can lead a community college in a manner that incorporates scholarship as an institutional value. Personal involvement in and presidential commitment to scholarship are unfortunately rare. The prevailing institutional culture at most community colleges, which assigns little value to scholarship, reflects the values of community college presidents (Pederson, 1989, p. 5). The president and the administrators of a college, as well as the faculty, have an obligation to live professional lives that project dedication to learning and scholarship. Scholarship and teaching should be perceived as inseparable; Carter (1980, p. 93) aptly states that they are like mutton and wool on a sheep. A president who desires to inculcate this value in others will engage in active scholarship, informing his or her tenure with the synthesis and application of current educational research.

Discipline-related scholarship invigorates individual faculty members. The intellectually stimulating environment created through scholarship communicates a love of learning to the students. The president and the faculty should join together to realize this vision. The teacher holds the power to help all students succeed, especially marginal students. An effective teacher who knows and loves a subject both inspires the students and illuminates the material. Community college presidents must provide the support and resources needed to sustain and empower faculty. The scholar-professor concept, then, enables faculty to enhance their teaching with the contemplation and exploration of both subject matter and the nature of learning.

Scholarship may take the form of personally exciting professional experiences or of new programs for the college. However, a semester spent reading and meditating on a topic of interest is personally valuable and certainly should not be discouraged. The greatest benefit of scholarship is quite simply the sheer fun of it. For instructors of the humanities few activities are more satisfying than the intellectual recreation derived from quiet hours spent in a good library, searching for new answers, new interpretations, and previously overlooked primary materials (Simonds, 1980, p. 2).

The process of scholarship is as important as the product. This is not to suggest that the outcomes of faculty scholarship are unimportant. Indeed, faculty projects are often valuable achievements that result in important critical insights and creative artifacts and publications. But the guidelines for college programs encouraging scholarship should be deliberately elastic, broad, and inclusive. Emphasis needs to be placed on the experience as well as the product of the individual faculty member. Experience helps teachers continue to learn, and that continuous learning is important.

I believe that a reframing of the role of scholarship in the professional lives of faculty will have significant results and will counter substantially the boredom and burnout that follow repetition and limited opportunity for intellectual stimulation. Conversations with faculty members have led me to the conclusion that the most important issue for faculty is time. Opportunities for periods of unfettered, unmanaged time for reflection provide an antidote to the poison of burnout and lead to vital scholarly renewal. It has been my experience that encouragement of scholarship through release time communicates a message of respect and trust, which in turn sends positive energy throughout the institution.

If we accept Cowley's (1950) definition of scholarship as rationalistic pursuit of understanding, it becomes an appropriate intellectual exercise in any academic or technical field. Traditions are built through process and a shared consensus of values. If, indeed, we begin to honor the scholar-professors among us, we become both supporters of and participants in the vibrant and noble tradition of informed, ever-exciting teaching. Only through this kind of teaching can the community college fulfill its mission: to intervene and make a difference in the lives of diverse, unique, and very special students.

References

Baker, P. J. "The Helter-Skelter Relationship Between Teaching and Research: A Cluster of Problems and Small Wins." *Teaching Sociology*, 1986, *14* (1), 50-66.

Baldwin, R. G., and Krotseng, M. V. "Incentives in the Academy: Issues and Options." In R. G. Baldwin (ed.), *Incentives for Faculty Vitality*. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Boyer, E. L. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

Boyer, E. L. "The New American Scholar." Keynote address at the National Conference on Higher Education of the American Association for Higher Education, San Francisco, April 1990.

Brookes, M. C., and German, K. L. *Meeting the Challenges: Developing Faculty Careers*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, no. 3. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1983. 54 pp. (ED 232 516)

Carter, C. *Higher Education for the Future*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell, 1980.

Clark, B. R. *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987.

Cohen, A. M., and Friedlander, J. "What Do Instructors Want?" *Community College Review*, 1980, *7* (3), 66-72.

Cowley, W. H. "Toward Harmonizing the Conflicting Points of View About the Ph.D. Curriculum for Preparing College Teachers." In F. Kelly (ed.), *Toward Better College Teaching*. Bulletin No. 13. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1950.

Cross, K. P. "Improving Learning in Community Colleges." Paper presented at the Association of Faculty for the Advancement of Community College Teaching Conference, Columbia, Maryland, November 1989.

Cross, K. P. "Introducing Ernest Boyer." Opening remarks at the National Conference on Higher Education of the American Association for Higher Education, San Francisco, April 1990.

Cross, K. P., and Angelo, T. A. "Faculty Members as Classroom Researchers: A Progress Report." *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal*, 1989, *59* (5), 23-25.

Green, M. F. "Introduction." In M. F. Green (ed.), *Minorities on Campus: A Handbook for Enhancing Diversity*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989.

Kellams, S. E. *The Community College Faculty Member as Researcher*. Charlottesville: Center for Higher Education, University of Virginia, 1974. 26 pp. (ED 100 428)

Knodt, E. A. "Taming Hydra: The Problem of Balancing Teaching and Scholarship at a Two-Year College." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 1988, *15* (3), 170-174.

National Science Foundation. *Science and Engineering Education in Two-Year Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1988.

National Science Foundation. *Report on the National Science Foundation Workshop on Science, Engineering, and Mathematics Education in Two-Year Colleges*. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1989. 17 pp. (ED 318 628)

O'Banion, T. *Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior Colleges*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1972.

Oromaner, M. *The Community College Professor: Teacher and Scholar*. ERIC Digest. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1986. 5 pp. (ED 272 248)

Parilla, R. E. "Faculty Scholarship: Revitalizing the Teacher/Learner Relationship." Paper presented at the Fall Research Symposium, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, November 1989.

Pederson, R. "The Community College Instructor as Professional." *Community College Week*, June 5, 1989, p. 5.

Seidman, E. *In the Words of the Faculty: Perspectives on Improving Teaching and Educational Quality in Community Colleges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Simonds, P. M. "Scholarship and the Community College." *Community College Humanist*, 1980, *2* (3), 2.

Valverde, L. A. "Low-Income Students." In L. Noel, R. Levitz, D. Saluri, and Associates, *Increasing Student Retention*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Vaughan, G. B. "Scholarship in Community Colleges: The Path to Respect." *Educational Record*, 1988, *69* (2), 26-31.

Robert E. Parilla is president of Montgomery College, Rockville, Maryland.

Presidents who engage in scholarly pursuits are more effective educational leaders.

Presidential Scholarship and Educational Leadership in the Community College

Robert G. Templin, Jr.

America's community colleges have historically stressed the importance of excellence in teaching. Often, the teaching mission of the community college has been contrasted with the research mission of the university as a means of defining the distinctive role that community colleges play in higher education (Townsend, 1989). But in the process of drawing attention to the differences between teaching institutions and research institutions, a false dichotomy emerges, namely, the notion that good teaching and scholarship are antithetical. As Vaughan (1988, p. 30) notes, this false dichotomy misses the point, for the real debate "is not one of teaching versus research but rather one of the community college faculty member as teacher and scholar versus as teacher only."

This chapter takes the view that scholarship in the community college has been underrated, not only in its connection to good teaching but also in its relationship to college leadership, especially at the presidential level. My thesis here is that community college presidents should engage in scholarly activity because it contributes to their effectiveness as educational leaders. In support of this thesis, I examine how presidential scholarship enhances leadership effectiveness and how the nation's "blue-chip" community college presidents remain active as scholars. I also review the barriers to presidential involvement in scholarship and conclude with suggestions for overcoming these barriers by integrating scholarship into the president's day-to-day routine and by using more effectively the resources and services that are readily available to presidents.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES, no. 76, Winter 1991 © Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers

Why Engage in Scholarship?

Is there an appropriate place for scholarship in the community college presidency? If there is, how important is it and how is it related to presidential effectiveness? Given all that today's community college presidents are expected to do, why is it important for presidents to engage in scholarship?

In a word, the answer to these questions is *leadership*. But I am not referring to the kind of leadership that we typically associate with the successful heads of giant corporations or of nonprofit organizations such as hospitals or government agencies. True, many management roles and functions are common to all of these settings and applicable to the community college as well. But the type of leadership required at community colleges is related to their heritage as institutions of higher education. We must have presidents who are *educational* leaders. As Cross (1990, p. 2) points out, "Recent surveys of community college leaders confirm that most see educational leadership as the emerging role for community college presidents. Successful leaders will not be able to slight managerial responsibilities or concerns of effective governance, but times call for leadership that goes beyond building a strong organization to utilizing that organization effectively in accomplishing its educational mission."

Successful presidential involvement in scholarly activity helps establish and develop educational leadership in four ways. First, scholarly activity keeps the president in touch with the core values of the higher education enterprise. Second, visible scholarship from the president creates an institutional climate that encourages a commitment to scholarship and learning at all levels of the college. Third, active scholarship can be a powerful tool for the president to use in gaining credibility within the academic community. Finally, scholarship contributes to presidential renewal and revitalization and helps sustain the professional enthusiasm and commitment necessary for effective educational leadership.

Keeping in Touch with Core Values. One of the primary responsibilities of college presidents as educational leaders is to cultivate, protect, and communicate the core values that are essential to the mission of their institutions. Because community colleges are first and foremost institutions of higher education, these values include academic freedom and the relentless pursuit of truth and knowledge. These values undergird the research functions of universities but are also necessary for and inseparable from good teaching at all colleges and universities. Unless the president periodically experiences a renewed commitment to these core elements, he or she places the institution's integrity at risk. Renewed contact with the heart of the enterprise through scholarly work such as teaching, disciplined observation and reflection, and writing prevents the president from losing sight of the institution's mission in higher education.

Setting an Institutional Climate. The institutional climate supporting scholarship at the community college is presently weak at many campuses. This weakness has been highlighted by the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988), whose report emphasized the need for college leaders to foster vibrant intellectual environments at their institutions: "We find it especially disturbing," the commission noted, "that 63 percent of the community college faculty in a national survey rated the intellectual environment at their institution as 'fair' or 'poor.' In a climate such as this, teaching effectiveness is diminished and the potential for excellence is lost" (p. 11). Pellino, Blackburn, and Boberg (1984) provide supporting evidence, pointing out that more than 75 percent of community college faculty are not actively engaged in scholarship and that the majority have not been active since graduate school. Perhaps this condition is understandable, because community colleges are poorly organized and supported to sponsor research in the classical sense. More troubling, however, is their finding that a majority of community college faculty spend fewer than five hours per week devoted to any type of scholarly activity beyond classroom teaching.

Presidential leadership that encourages and recognizes faculty involvement in scholarship strengthens the intellectual climate of the institution and thus facilitates excellence in the classroom. It is through scholarship that good teachers extend their knowledge and renew their enthusiasm for their subject matter. When the president personally engages in scholarly activity, he or she enhances an institutional climate that encourages scholarship and learning at all levels within the college. Institutional leadership of this sort is required to transform the prevailing campus culture in the ways recommended by the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988).

Gaining Credibility. Because the community college is fundamentally an institution of higher education committed to excellence in instruction, it is important that the president be seen, especially by colleagues inside the institution, as a capable scholar. Intellectual achievement demonstrated through writings, presentations, and effective classroom teaching are key to establishing and maintaining the president's credibility within the academic community. Presidents who do not engage in scholarship diminish their claim to leadership. Boston University president John Silber (1988, p. 17) stated the problem succinctly: "If intellectual achievements do not allow the president to hold his or her own in the [institution's] intellectual 'pecking order,' he or she is at a great disadvantage. If his or her intellectual competence is manifest, however, he or she can ignore the ruling clichés and assert the capacity for judgment." Silber's observation pertains as much to community colleges as it does to universities.

Renewing and Revitalizing Oneself as President. One of the obligations of any professional is to remain current in one's field and to contribute to the exchange of ideas and the advancement of knowledge. The practice of reading regularly, as Fretwell (1988) points out, is the number-one requirement for maintaining professional viability. Productivity—in the scholarly sense—is a second requirement. Scholarship, like physical fitness, is a task for which most of us must make time if we are to perform optimally and remain healthy. The mental exercise that scholarship requires leads to clarity of thought and optimal performance. The pursuit of scholarship leads us, in a disciplined way, to specify what we feel, what we believe in, and why. It also leads us, often through an intense and somewhat painful process, to put into writing what we have intuitively felt but could not previously find the words to express. And because it results in a publication or other product that is available to the scrutiny of others, it leaves us vulnerable to the criticism of those who do not share our points of view and causes us to reexamine and reformulate our beliefs. In short, scholarship is important to a president's intellectual fitness just as surely as exercise is essential to his or her physical fitness. As a result, those who engage in scholarly activity are refreshed and renewed by it and better able to sustain their commitment to the community college mission.

Presidential Scholarship and Leadership Effectiveness

If effective leadership is related to presidential scholarship, it is reasonable to assume that America's most effective community college leaders are active scholars. As a rough test of this assumption, I examined the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) data base for the past five years to gauge, at least partially, the scholarly contributions of the fifty-one blue-chip presidents identified by Roueche, Baker, and Rose (1989) in their study of transformational leadership. (The "blue-chippers" were identified through a two-stage process of colleague nominations, and thus the category consists of those presidents who—in the opinion of those presidents polled by Roueche, Baker, and Rose—are outstanding community college leaders.)

The results were impressive. Of the fifty-one blue-chip presidents, thirty-nine (more than three-fourths) were cited as the authors of documents, conference papers, or published journal articles listed in the ERIC data base. Nearly half (25) had authored published articles. While presidential scholarship is not a guarantee of presidential success, it appears that America's most successful and effective community college presidents are, at least to some degree, scholars as well. A more intensive investigation, including items not listed in ERIC, would probably have uncovered even greater scholarly activity.

Barriers to Presidential Scholarship

Why don't more community college presidents engage in scholarship? The answer seems to revolve around four barriers. First, many presidents believe that scholarship is not an important presidential role. Second, scholarship is often viewed by community college administrators and faculty as a distant, university-based activity that is unrelated to the day-to-day management responsibilities of community college presidents. Third, most presidents do not feel that they have enough time to engage in scholarship, given the daily press of more immediate demands. Finally, the professional preparation of many presidents may be ill-suited to the performance of rigorous scholarly work.

A Matter of Priority. The first and most pervasive barrier to presidential involvement in scholarship is the widely shared view that scholarship is not important to the community college mission or to the performance of the president. Vaughan (1988), Parilla (1987), and the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988) point out the fallaciousness of this belief, arguing that the integrity of the community college rests largely on its commitment to an appropriately broad definition of scholarship. But their views have only recently gained national attention, and the old perception of scholarship as a nonissue at the community college endures. Furthermore, if presidents do not see a strong link between scholarship and the college mission, they see scholarship as having even less relevance to their own roles as chief executive officers. Vaughan's (1986) study of the community college presidency found that presidents ranked the task of writing publishable articles at the very bottom of a list of skills and abilities important to presidential success. Until presidents see the connection between the teaching mission of the community college in general and their own leadership effectiveness in particular, scholarly activity will continue to have low priority.

Narrow Definition of Scholarship. Another significant barrier to presidential scholarship is the restrictive manner in which scholarly activity has been defined. Too often, community college presidents fall victim to the narrow view of scholarship as work tied solely to original research and publication. Consequently, community college presidents see scholarship as the abstract and distant domain of university research projects and laboratories, not of community college classrooms and administrative offices where pragmatic, day-to-day operational concerns are more often the focus of activity.

Recently, however, the need for a more inclusive definition of scholarship has been raised by a number of leaders, including Vaughan (1988), Cross and Angelo (1988), the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Mooney, 1990), and the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988). They propose broader definitions of scholarship that recognize the legitimate role of faculty as classroom researchers as well as the role of presidents and other members of the college community as disciplined observers. All can engage in useful scholarship without necessarily publishing original research findings that have little practical application to college affairs.

As for the presidents, their scholarship should be applicable to the pragmatic concerns of educational leadership. For example, few publications are more practical or useful than a strategically timed, well-reasoned op-ed piece in a newspaper, explaining why access to higher education deserves public support. A well-conceived and executed research report on the success of community college transfer students is another example; authored by the president, such a report can enhance the college's reputation in the eyes of the general public and of the four-year university and college community as well. Teaching is also important to presidential scholarship and has practical payoffs. A president who occasionally teaches and who develops a reputation for being an excellent instructor may well increase the respect that he or she enjoys from faculty.

Time. Lack of time is the barrier most frequently cited by presidents when asked why they do not often engage in scholarship. This is understandable, given the busy lives presidents lead and the considerable time commitment that good scholarship demands. But the perceived lack of time is in reality a function of the degree to which presidents understand the importance of scholarship to their own leadership effectiveness. In the minds of most presidents, this effectiveness is more likely to be associated with the action-oriented roles of manager, fund-raiser, and legislative lobbyist and less likely to be associated with the reflective role of the scholar. If scholarship is not seen to enhance success in at least some of these action roles, presidents will continue to see scholarship as a peripheral activity for which there is little time to spare.

Professional Preparation. A fourth barrier lies in the fact that community college presidents have not been expected to engage in scholarship, either in their formal educational preparation or in their roles as college chief executive officers. Many, if not most, community college presidents do not have advanced degrees in academic disciplines that maintain the traditions of research, critical analysis, and writing for publication as inherent facets of graduate study (Vaughan and Baker, 1988). It is therefore understandable that many presidents do not value scholarship as an integral part of their professional identity. This lack of preparation also explains why some presidents do not feel confident in their scholarly abilities, even if they have the desire to engage in scholarship. It may even explain why community college leaders often react defensively in the face of scholarly criticism.

Tips for the Presidential Scholar

Although many presidents consider scholarship to be marginally related to their leadership roles and contrary to the pragmatic requirements of their jobs, some embrace scholarship as an essential aspect of their professional lives. They have developed techniques for integrating scholarship into the multiple demands of their work and have used scholarship to reinforce their effectiveness as leaders. Tips for remaining active in scholarship, derived from conversations that I have had with some of the blue-chip presidents highlighted in Roueche, Baker, and Rose's (1989) study, are outlined below.

Actively Read and Attend Professional Meetings. Nearly all of those presidents polled indicated that it was not enough to read the professional literature and attend conferences and professional meetings. It is important to *actively* engage in these activities, keeping notes of key ideas, questions, and reactions. One president suggested that it was helpful to distill notes down to one or two important thoughts, keeping them for later reference.

Build a Fact File. Many of the presidents queried keep a file of their notes, along with quotes and useful statistics. The items in these "fact files" are kept for future reference when preparing for a conference or writing a speech.

Produce Manuscripts from Speeches. Most presidents give speeches and presentations to civic clubs, city council meetings, professional groups, or meetings of state legislatures. Often, these speeches require extensive preparation and deal with issues that are of interest to a wider public than those sitting in the audience. Yet, when each speech or presentation is completed, presidents often file their notes or, worse, simply throw them away. Several of the blue-chip presidents observed that both of these actions are mistakes and suggested that presentations should be recorded, transcribed, and edited for use as op-ed pieces or journal articles. Others suggested that these manuscripts be critiqued by colleagues, especially subordinates, in order to stimulate them to think creatively about emerging issues and to help foster an institutional environment that encourages scholarship. Finally, presidents should send copies of their manuscripts to the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges so that the material can be disseminated to the profession at large.

Teach. Few activities cause a person to reestablish contact with the heartbeat of a college more quickly than does teaching. A president need not accept full responsibility for teaching an entire course; co-teaching with a faculty member or accepting responsibility for several sessions with the same class offers many opportunities for scholarly stimulation and renewal. The practice of serving as a guest lecturer on campus or in a graduate class at a nearby university is also a feasible option, even for the busiest of presidents.

Utilize College Resources. A number of resources, available to every president on his or her own campus, can be used to increase efficiency and reduce the legwork associated with scholarly activity. Chief among these resources are the college's reference librarians. These professionals can identify facts, obtain resource materials, and perform literature searches. Another campus resource is the institutional research office, whose staff can provide advice on the collection, analysis, and reporting of data. Too often, these internal resources are overlooked.

Collaborate with Others. Many of the blue-chip presidents suggested collaboration with colleagues who have the time, skill, and desire to pursue a topic of mutual interest. Such collaboration allows for an efficient division of labor. Presidents who use this strategy usually contribute to the selection of a topic, to the initial formulation of the problem or the thesis, to the review and critique process, and to the revision and rewriting of the manuscript. The collaborating partner usually completes the time-consuming tasks of gathering relevant literature and collecting and analyzing data. There is wide variation concerning which partner actually develops the initial draft. Sometimes it starts with a transcript of a speech or presentation delivered by the president. In other cases, the collaborator completes the bulk of the work on the first draft; whereas in still other instances, he or she is responsible for all but the final product or serves as a ghost writer (a somewhat questionable practice when the president claims authorship).

Among the collaborators most frequently mentioned by the blue-chip presidents were administrative assistants, institutional researchers, and graduate students. One president suggested collaborative efforts with university colleagues who have a mandate to publish and may welcome the opportunity to add a pragmatic dimension to their research. Collaboration as co-chairs of a commission or task force charged with the responsibility of producing a published report is another way that busy presidents can integrate scholarship into their schedules.

Accept a Professional Assignment. Most presidents receive offers to formally present their ideas on professional topics. Such opportunities for professional service may involve chairing an accreditation team, serving as a panelist at a state meeting, presenting a paper at a national conference, or submitting an article for publication. Assignments with deadlines for submitting manuscripts often help presidents make scholarship a priority within busy day-to-day schedules that would otherwise not leave room for such work.

Integrating Scholarship with the Presidential Role

Why should presidents engage in scholarship? The primary reason is that scholarship distinguishes the educational leader from the bureaucratic manager. Robert McCabe (1988, pp. 19–20), a blue-chip president who is one of the nation's most active scholar-presidents, stresses the importance and the difficulty of the president's role as educational leader: "Today the president's attention is being focused either outside the institution or on operational concerns, and the result is that educational issues are most often left to others. . . . In the current environment, it is difficult but essential for a president to give primary attention to educational issues." Scholarship is an undervalued and often overlooked strategy available to community college presidents who want to give greater attention to educational issues and thus enhance their own roles as educational leaders.

There are many reasons why presidents find it difficult to engage in scholarship. To overcome these barriers, presidents must integrate scholarly activity into their daily responsibilities and into the overall requirements of the job. In addition, the task of scholarship is made easier when presidents use the many resources that are available to them by virtue of their position. Scholarship need not be an impractical exercise. When integrated into the president's role, scholarship is one of the most useful activities that presidents can undertake to enhance their educational leadership.

References

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1988. 58 pp. (ED 293 578)

Cross, K. P. "Leadership for Teaching and Learning." In D. Doucette (ed.), *Leadership Abstracts,* vol. 3, nos. 1-20. Laguna Hills, Calif.: League for Innovation in the Community College, 1990. 42 pp. (ED 331 574)

Cross, K. P., and Angelo, T. A. *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for Faculty.* Ann Arbor: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning, University of Michigan, 1988. 166 pp. (ED 317 097)

Fretwell, E. K., Jr. "Keeping Presidents Fully Alive." In J. L. Fisher and M. W. Tack (eds.), *Leaders on Leadership: The College Presidency.* New Directions for Higher Education, no. 61. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

McCabe, R. H. "Focusing on Educational Issues." In J. L. Fisher and M. W. Tack (eds.), *Leaders on Leadership: The College Presidency.* New Directions for Higher Education, no. 61. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Mooney, C. J. "Higher Education Conferees Applaud Carnegie Plan to Broaden the Definition of Faculty Scholarship." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* Apr. 11, 1990, pp. A1, A16.

Parilla, R. E. "Scholarship in Community Colleges." *College Teaching,* 1987, *35* (3), 111-112.

Pellino, G. R., Blackburn, R. T., and Boberg, A. L. "The Dimensions of Academic Scholarship: Faculty and Administrator Views." *Research in Higher Education,* 1984, *20* (1), 103-115.

Roueche, J. E., Baker, G. A., III, and Rose, R. *Shared Vision: Transformational Leadership in American Community Colleges.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1989. 337 pp. (ED 307 013)

Silber, J. "Should College Presidents Be Educators?" In J. L. Fisher and M. W. Tack (eds.), *Leaders on Leadership: The College Presidency.* New Directions for Higher Education, no. 61. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988.

Townsend, B. K. (ed.). *A Search for Institutional Distinctiveness.* New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 65. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989.

Vaughan, G. B. *The Community College Presidency.* New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan, 1986.

Vaughan, G. B. "Scholarship in Community Colleges: The Path to Respect." *Educational Record,* 1988, *69* (2), 26-31.

Vaughan, G. B., and Baker, G. A., III. "Point-Counterpoint: The Academic Background of the Community College President." *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal,* 1988, *58* (5), 12-13.

Robert G. Templin, Jr., is president of Thomas Nelson Community College, Hampton, Virginia.

As the institution's instructional leader, the community college academic dean can help establish scholarship as an integral part of the campus environment.

Scholarship and the Academic Dean

James R. Perkins

In many respects, the academic dean holds the most difficult position within the community college. He or she must guide the direction of the instructional program and, at the same time, handle a multitude of matters that affect the everyday life of the college. Notwithstanding the pressing need to handle all correspondence with care, complete all reports in a timely manner, organize routine office functions, respond to requests for information, and maintain contact with faculty and students, the academic dean must remember that the primary responsibility of the office is instructional leadership. He or she must have a clear sense of the issues that affect education in general and higher education in particular.

But beyond knowledge of the issues, the effective academic dean must be able to communicate those issues and their implications for the college to the president, students, faculty, and staff. By establishing a dialogue with the college community regarding the future of the instructional program, the academic dean can assume a position of instructional leadership within the college and help establish the academic vision needed to determine how teaching excellence can be promoted, how curricula should change to reflect the needs of the community, how the academic program should respond to the public's call for accountability, and how the balance between general education and technical competence can be ensured among all graduates.

Unfortunately, most academic deans do not place a high priority on scholarship as a means of establishing an academic vision for the college.

The author acknowledges the contribution of Michael H. Parsons, dean of instruction at Hagerstown Junior College (Maryland), to the preparation of this chapter.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES, no. 76, Winter 1991 © Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers

Vaughan (1990) found that academic deans do not often see scholarship as important to success in their positions and are not actively involved in scholarly activities. This finding is not surprising in light of the fact that community college presidents give the ability to produce scholarly publications the lowest rank among those skills needed for success by both the president and his or her subordinates (Vaughan, 1986, p. 188). The actions of the academic dean often reflect the priorities of the president.

Nonetheless, the academic dean can serve as an effective instructional mentor for other members of the college community by challenging them to explore issues that affect higher education, by providing stimulating readings, by scheduling worthwhile workshops, and by promoting scholarly activity. An academic dean who engages in an active program of scholarly inquiry, especially in the field of higher education, can use the results of that scholarship to influence the intellectual environment of the campus.

Developing the College's Intellectual Climate

The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988) has challenged every community college faculty member to be a dedicated scholar. While the commission does not advocate that every faculty member be a published researcher, it nonetheless recognizes that a broad view of scholarship is an essential part of faculty effectiveness. As the commission points out, "In addition to the scholarship of *discovering* knowledge, through research, it is also important to recognize the scholarship of *integrating* knowledge, through curriculum development, the scholarship of *applying* knowledge, through service, and above all, the scholarship of *presenting* knowledge, through effective teaching" (p. 26).

Because community colleges were developed as teaching institutions, not as research institutions, academic deans may find that many institutional policies or practices, such as those dealing with faculty leave, instructional load, and facility construction and space assignment, act as barriers to scholarship. For example, some institutions recognize traditional graduate study as the only justification for leave with partial pay. New construction and existing space assignments often do not allot sufficient space for the conduct of instructional research or other scholarship. Release time policies often do not recognize scholarship as a viable activity worthy of institutional support. Team teaching or other collaborative activities often are not recognized in faculty load calculations. Few institutions have reward structures that recognize faculty scholarship.

Academic deans should identify and eliminate these barriers. The checklist in Exhibit 5.1 is offered as a means of assessing the degree to which intellectual activity and scholarly involvement are promoted within the institution. Once the data drawn from the application of the checklist have been analyzed, they can be used to stimulate discussion among stu-

Exhibit 5.1. Checklist for Assessing Institutional Support for Intellectual Activity and Scholarly Involvement

_____ Intellectual and scholarly activity among students and faculty is a stated value of the institution.
_____ Reward systems for scholarly activity are in place.
_____ Opportunities are available for faculty and students to engage in scholarship as a normal part of their employment or study.
_____ Resources are available within the college budget to support scholarly activities.
_____ Institutional evaluation systems include consideration of intellectual development and scholarship.
_____ Promotion and tenure decisions recognize faculty participation in scholarship.
_____ Institutional support in the form of clerical assistance, facilities, travel, photocopying, mailing services, and library resources are available to support faculty and student scholarship.
_____ Professional development plans are in place for all college employees.
_____ Summer research grants, sabbatical leaves, and release time opportunities are all available to support the scholarly activities of college employees.
_____ Student activity programs include opportunities for students to develop the intellectual as well as the social and physical dimensions of their lives.
_____ Institutional ceremonies, traditions, and celebrations reflect an emphasis on the importance of intellectual development and scholarship among faculty and students.
_____ Forums are regularly organized to provide opportunities for faculty and staff to share the results of their scholarship.
_____ The president and academic dean promote intellectual development and scholarship by serving as positive role models.
_____ Current publications in higher education are available in the faculty lounge and are routinely circulated among college employees.
_____ Proposals from faculty and college administrators to secure funds that support the intellectual development of the campus are encouraged, and assistance is available to help with the preparation of grant applications.

dents and faculty regarding the college's intellectual environment. Viewed in this way, the checklist can help the campus establish priorities and create a vision of what is possible.

The American Association for Higher Education, in cooperation with the Education Commission of the States and the Johnson Foundation, also suggests that the college prepare institutional inventories of scholarly activities. A series of questions designed to discover the amount of participation in scholarship throughout the college could assist in this effort. Examples include the following: What percentage of faculty are now enrolled in graduate study? What percentage of faculty have presented conference papers or published at least one article within the past year? How many faculty have participated in sabbaticals, summer research projects, artist-in-residence projects, or other related programs in the past year? How many campus forums or colloquia were held in the last year as a means of providing faculty and students with a forum for sharing the results of their research projects? What was the attendance? What percentage of the college operating budget is devoted to faculty and staff development? How many programs were scheduled in the last year to honor faculty or student scholarship? On how many occasions in the last year did the academic dean and president participate in open discussions of issues in higher education with faculty and students?

Answers to these questions, when integrated with results from an intellectual climate checklist, such as Exhibit 5.1, create a data base that can be used to measure progress over time in the development of an institutional environment that promotes scholarship. Each academic dean may then devise a plan for enhancing campus intellectual life. These plans should reflect the unique characteristics, needs, and values of the institution. Schuster, Wheeler, and Associates (1990) suggest that any program intended to enhance the intellectual environment of a college requires faculty "ownership" in development and governance, as well as an informed administration familiar with trends in professional fields.

Supporting Professional Development Opportunities

Noting that community colleges do not emphasize scholarship, Vaughan (1988) conjectures that community college faculty and administrators have been sidetracked by the debate on teaching versus research. Community college teachers, so the debate goes, concentrate their efforts on good teaching, leaving research to faculty at universities and graduate schools. Unfortunately, the lack of emphasis on research in community colleges is often used to excuse faculty and administrators from pursuing scholarship.

The report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988) provides useful insights into ways of involving faculty in scholarly activities that enhance the teaching function. The commission recommends that "community colleges . . . define the role of the faculty member as classroom researcher—focusing evaluation on instruction and making a clear connection between what the teacher teaches and how students learn" (p. 27). Community college faculty should thus be encouraged to use their classrooms as laboratories where successful methods of instruction are explored and results are shared with others.

Cross (1988) sees classroom research as an important means of narrowing a number of significant gaps in higher education, such as the gaps between teaching and learning, between the process of teaching and the content of the subject, and between teaching and testing. Community college faculty can help find solutions to the problems created by these gaps by focusing on the classroom as a laboratory for scholarly inquiry.

Parnell (1990) advocates technology transfer as another important way that faculty can relate scholarship to teaching. By viewing their role as agents of technology transfer, faculty can establish scholarly programs that take the results of university or corporate research to individuals in the field. This view may be particularly helpful to those who teach technical disciplines. For example, faculty who teach in-office technology programs could be encouraged to review new word-processing or data management programs and share their findings with students, secretaries, and managers. Written critiques with suggestions for the best means of incorporating the new products could be particularly helpful to area employers. Similarly, new processes in electronics testing could be examined by electronics faculty and shared with companies in the college's service district. These new processes could be compared with current practices, and opportunities for quality improvement and cost containment could be explored. Faculty who engage in technology transfer by providing new knowledge to their students and to the wider community make an important scholarly contribution, especially if this new knowledge is carefully critiqued and if advantages and disadvantages of new technologies are made clear.

Although there are many opportunities for faculty to develop scholarship as an integral part of the teaching function, deans must realize that unless the institution actively supports faculty scholarship efforts, these efforts are not likely to be an important element within the institutional culture. Examples of ways that academic deans can promote scholarly attitudes among faculty and staff include the following: (1) Establish a summer faculty grant program that supports faculty scholarship and research for the improvement of instruction. (2) Develop faculty colloquia in which results of scholarly endeavors are shared with colleagues. Be the first speaker. (3) Establish a faculty reading room in which space, materials, and quiet are available for thinking and learning. (4) Establish recognition ceremonies to bring attention to faculty and staff who have published articles in professional journals or presented papers to professional peers at regional or national meetings. (5) Establish a professional development budget representing at least 2 percent of the general instructional operating fund and assign a portion of that budget to a faculty and staff committee charged with developing and promoting scholarly events on campus. And (6) encourage cooperative efforts among faculty from different disciplines. Provide incentives for participation in collaborative activities.

Fostering Student Scholarship

The academic environment of an institution is greatly enriched when faculty and students are engaged in projects that result in publications, presentations, or performances. The academic dean can influence student and faculty interactions by structuring opportunities for faculty that involve students in scholarship.

A variety of campus organizations can be established to promote student interest in scholarship and to present the results of students' scholarly work: literary clubs, debate societies, theater and dance organizations, honor societies, scientific organizations, and other, similar groups. The key to the success of any of these organizations is an enthusiastic faculty that enjoys working with students. Institutional support in the form of time, funding, and recognition is essential if faculty are to lead activities of this nature. Academic deans can support faculty interest in these projects through release time, reduced class assignments, special salary supplements, or a reduction in other committee assignments. Some activities can be incorporated into the faculty member's normal teaching assignments. For example, literary magazines could result from assignments in creative writing classes. Special independent study classes might be established to allow a faculty member to work with one or two students in a scholarly investigation. Academic deans can influence college policy to give appropriate recognition to faculty who participate in these projects.

Boyer (1987) notes that most time during the undergraduate years is spent outside the classroom and that what students do during this time profoundly influences the quality of their educational experience. Academic deans can create opportunities that expose students to scholarly works by scheduling lecture series, artist-in-residence programs, concerts, theater performances, or scientific and technical exhibits. The success of any of these programs depends largely on the participation of students and faculty in program development and review. Faculty who organize the content of their courses around programs of this nature can influence student participation.

Within the classroom, academic deans should encourage teaching strategies that promote active learning and self-directed study. Students should be encouraged to participate in small group discussions and to work together on group projects. Student scholarship resulting from class projects should be celebrated, and opportunities should be provided for students to present their work to the campus community and to professional associations. Travel funds should be available to assist students and faculty with presentations of this nature.

Academic deans interested in promoting scholarly work among all students can look to the college curricula for opportunities. The general education core should be examined to determine if it encourages the integration of separate disciplines and their application to current issues. Capstone courses for majors could provide opportunities for students to synthesize the content of the associate degree requirements and to develop an original paper or presentation for consideration by peers. Cooperative education or internship experiences could provide opportunities for students to develop scholarly projects relating classroom content to work experience.

Opportunities for stimulating student scholarship are limitless. Interested, persistent, patient, and skillful academic deans can help create environments in which scholarly activity is an expected part of the college experience.

The Academic Dean as Scholar

Just as community college faculty have been sidetracked by the teaching-versus-research debate, using it to cloud their responsibility for academic scholarship, two-year college academic deans often do not see the positive influence that a program of scholarship can have on the success of their own professional lives. Good academic practitioners, after all, must base their decisions on sound information, subject their thinking to debate and clarification among the academic community, and use the latest research in the field to influence the direction of the institution. Academic deans who pursue a sound program of academic scholarship, especially in the field of higher education, are in a more informed position to lead their institutions and to lead regional and national associations concerned with the welfare of the community college. An academic dean who is not engaged in an active program of scholarship will not be successful in encouraging others to see scholarship as important to their roles within the college.

Thus, the dean's first step in moving the cultural orientation of the institution toward scholarship must be to establish scholarship as an important responsibility of his or her own position. Deans who are involved in their profession—either by synthesizing readings and presenting their findings to peers for critical examination or by conducting studies that examine critical issues in higher education—find that they can influence attitudes toward scholarship on their campuses. Opportunities are increasingly available in the 1990s. The commitment to institutional excellence through assessment is a prime directive of the Middle States, North Central, and Southern accrediting associations. Further, a number of states have adopted accountability plans that encourage evaluation and outcomes analysis. The academic dean as instructional leader should play a central role in each of these activities.

Yet, often the failure of the president to see scholarship as important to the mission of the community college impairs the involvement of the dean in scholarly activities. The academic dean's position is demanding, and pressures from all sides require these deans to perform a multitude of tasks. Unless scholarship is a valued activity that is promoted by the president, many academic deans simply will not find the time to pursue scholarly activities. Presidents can help academic deans promote an attitude of scholarly involvement on their campuses by listing scholarship as an important value of the institution and including scholarship within the mission of the institution. Academic deans can assist in this process by showing presidents how scholarly activities contribute to the intellectual climates of their campuses. Presidents and academic deans should begin a dialogue that focuses on the role of scholarship in promoting the goals of their institutions.

The failure of many deans to view higher education as their primary field of inquiry also impairs their involvement in scholarly activities. This failure is understandable, because a majority of academic deans begin their careers as teachers in the arts and sciences. Many have completed doctorates in fields such as English, history, mathematics, or sociology (Puyear, Perkins, and Vaughan, 1990) and as a result identify with those disciplines and view them as their primary fields of study. Nonetheless, the dean's everyday activities involve issues in higher education, and it is through examination of these issues that the dean can make his or her most significant contribution.

The importance of scholarship in the field of higher education does not mean that scholarly work in the arts and sciences is inappropriate. Indeed, deans can use the investigative methods and research techniques learned through study of their original disciplines to conduct scholarly inquiries in higher education. Viewed in this way, higher education is an applied field of study, appropriate for inquiry from the perspectives of the historian, sociologist, mathematician, engineer, or physical scientist. Community college education could benefit, for example, from carefully developed studies in organizational behavior from the point of view of a sociologist or a psychologist. Mathematicians and historians could lend insights into the issue of assessment in higher education. Every discipline can bring skills to bear on issues that affect the way we do business in higher education. Too often, however, academic deans do not pursue scholarly activities of any sort, either in their original disciplines or in higher education.

For many of the reasons mentioned above, scholarly inquiry has not been a tradition within the community college. If scholarship is to become an important part of the community college culture, academic deans must take the lead by accepting the position of role model for scholarship within their institutions. Deans can exemplify scholarship in the following ways:

1. Review the literature on issues facing the college and use the results to work with faculty and staff in developing plans of action that address these issues.
2. Pursue an active reading program in the field of higher education.
3. Collaborate with faculty and with the college president on projects of mutual interest that result in scholarly publications or presentations.
4. Seek leadership positions in professional associations and use those positions to develop opportunities for scholarly presentations.

5. Contribute articles on issues facing community colleges to campus publications or local newspapers.
6. Use the college institutional research office for informational support of scholarly work that helps solve campus problems and gives greater insight into the solution of similar problems on other campuses.
7. Use staff meetings as opportunities for scholarly interaction and as forums for the debate of issues broader than those that directly affect the institution.
8. Ensure that professional development is a normal part of each employee's goals and evaluations.
9. Insist that one's own performance be judged on the basis of contributions made to the larger profession.

Summary

The academic dean's primary responsibility is that of instructional leader. He or she must have a clear understanding of the issues facing higher education and must be able to communicate those issues to the campus community. Academic deans who are involved in active programs of scholarship, especially in the field of higher education, are in a position to lead instructional programs and to influence the intellectual life of their campuses.

The academic dean can serve as a role model and mentor, demonstrating how scholarship can be used to solve campus problems and encouraging all employees to see scholarship as an integral part of their job descriptions. Once scholarship is a stated value of the institution and is firmly a part of the institution's mission, academic deans can lead the way in encouraging, celebrating, and rewarding scholarship among students, faculty, staff, other administrators, and the president.

References

Boyer, E. L. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America.* New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1988. 58 pp. (ED 293 578)

Cross, K. P. "In Search of Zippers." *AAHE Bulletin,* 1988, *40* (10), 3-7.

Parnell, D. *Dateline 2000: The New Higher Education Agenda.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1990. 304 pp. (ED 316 270)

Puyear, D. E., Perkins, J. R., and Vaughan, G. B. "Pathway to the Presidency: Community College Deans of Instruction." *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal,* 1990, *60* (5), 33-36.

Schuster, J. H., Wheeler, D. W., and Associates. *Enhancing Faculty Careers: Strategies for Development and Renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Vaughan, G. B. *The Community College Presidency*. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan, 1986.

Vaughan, G. B. "Scholarship in Community Colleges: The Path to Respect." *Educational Record*, 1988, *69* (2), 26-31.

Vaughan, G. B. *Pathway to the Presidency: Community College Deans of Instruction*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1990. 228 pp. (ED 318 526)

James R. Perkins is president of Blue Ridge Community College, Wyers Cave, Virginia, and past dean of instruction at Piedmont Virginia Community College, Charlottesville.

If humanities faculty are not engaged in scholarship, if they are not active learners, they cannot effectively instruct students on the insights and skills that study in the humanities properly fosters.

Scholarship in the Humanities

Barbara Viniar, Libby Bay

The goals of scholarship in the humanities are the same as those of teaching the humanities: to communicate a vision of society and encourage commitment to the values inherent to that vision. Instruction in the humanities has received a great deal of attention in the last several years, resulting in a renewed commitment to the place of the humanities in the curriculum and a reinvigorated debate over the content of the canon. In the report that initiated this debate at the national level, *To Reclaim a Legacy*, Bennett (1984, p. 3) poses several questions about society's values: "What is justice? What should be loved? What deserves to be defended? What is courage? What is noble? What is base? Why do civilizations flourish? Why do they decline?" There is little agreement as to whether a single set of traditions can or should provide answers to those questions, but there is no disagreement on the vital function of the humanities as we seek answers to the questions.

The debate over the humanities has by no means bypassed the community college. After reviewing *To Reclaim a Legacy* and conducting a roundtable discussion of its relevance to community, technical, and junior colleges, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1986) issued a policy statement that defines the humanities in terms of

---

The authors thank colleagues at Rockland Community College, Suffern, New York, who contributed their thoughts to the development of this chapter. Other assistance was provided by representatives from the City University of New York/Mellon Project, Bergen Community College (New Jersey), Montgomery College (Maryland), Prince George's Community College (Maryland), and the Two-Year Development Center at the State University of New York, Albany.

both content (subject areas taught) and method (including the methods of inquiry in specific disciplines and in interdisciplinary fields). Responsibility for designing humanities programs is placed with the faculty. "Community college faculty must teach humanities to their students so that each student is better able to discover a sense of relationships among life, work, and circumstances; to understand self and society through different eyes, places, and times; to reflect on the way personal origins and beliefs affect actions and values; to encounter questions and answers posed in the past; and to raise similar questions about the present and the future" (p. 2). Three of the statement's recommendations focus on the development of good teaching skills and on the purchase of materials for research and cultural enrichment.

None of the statement's recommendations, however, deals with scholarship in the disciplines. Yet, if faculty are not engaged in scholarship, if they are not active learners, they cannot achieve the dynamic goals put forth in the AACJC statement. The process of discovery, reflection, inquiry, and understanding can only be guided by faculty who are actively engaged in their own versions of it.

Broadening the Definition of Scholarship

Unfortunately, the practical reality of being a scholar and a teacher at a community college entails too little time, too little money, and, frequently, too little recognition and support. With these handicaps, and with an overriding emphasis on teaching in promotion and tenure decisions, too many faculty perceive scholarship as a luxury that they cannot afford. When scholarship is encouraged or supported financially, it is often confined to areas of pedagogy or curriculum development. Scholarship in one's discipline remains a personal endeavor that is unrewarded by the institution.

Community college faculty are therefore particularly vulnerable to the false dichotomy between teaching and scholarship. Vaughan (1988, p. 30) notes that "the debate for the community college professional is not one of teaching versus research but rather one of the community college faculty member as teacher and scholar versus as teacher only." Nevertheless, the debate is most frequently presented as a standoff between scholarship and teaching. For example, when a recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (Schaefer, 1990) commented on the poor quality of most scholarship in the humanities, it drew a response from a community college faculty member (Howard, 1990) who indicated that he had resigned a position as a lecturer at a prestigious university because his failure to publish—despite an outstanding teaching record—would have eventually prevented him from receiving tenure. At a community college, however, he was able to teach rather than publish what Schaefer had termed "insignificant twaddle." This response perpetuates the notion that teaching and scholarship are mutually exclusive. It also exposes the writer as a victim of the pernicious assumptions that scholarship is confined to the preparation of publishable articles and that these publications must be abstruse and pedantic in order to impress promotion and tenure committees.

Such false notions are likely to continue if scholarship in graduate programs (where faculty are trained) and in colleges and universities (the higher education community to which faculty belong) is narrowly defined. When quantity and obscurity are rewarded at the expense of the ability to communicate clearly to what Booth (1988) calls the "literate public," then the public loses confidence in us as educators. Not only does this failure to communicate jeopardize our support from the public, and therefore the health of our institutions, but it also undermines our ability to communicate even with each other about new and important scholarship.

Faced with a crisis of confidence among the public, all aspects of higher education are under scrutiny, including the issues of what constitutes scholarship and how the definition of scholarship affects teaching. Recent attempts to define a broader faculty role in scholarship are therefore particularly welcome. The report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988), for example, broadened the definition of scholarship for all community college faculty, including those involved in technical and applied education. Scholarship, the commission notes, is the realm of the "dedicated scholar" who integrates, applies, or presents knowledge; it is not solely the domain of the published researcher (p. 26).

Echoes of this broadened definition appear in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities in the Professoriate* (Boyer, 1990). The report redefines scholarship to include "the way knowledge is applied, related to existing knowledge, and presented to students"; hence there is a need to "recognize and reward teaching, service, textbook writing, and other faculty activities" (Mooney, 1990, p. A1). In a speech in which he discussed the report, Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation, asked, "Isn't it time to acknowledge more openly that the system isn't working very well? Could we possibly begin to broaden the definition of what it means to be a scholar? And could we relate faculty rewards to the mission of the institution?" (Mooney, 1990, p. A16).

Answering Boyer's questions is the key task facing those who would revitalize faculty scholarship. When we move specifically to ways in which research and scholarship in the humanities can be encouraged and accomplished at community colleges, we can divide Gaul into four parts: internal or intrinsic motivators, institutional support, efforts of college consortia to enhance the humanities, and funding from external agencies. Each of these domains plays a considerable role in helping community college humanities faculty engage in scholarly pursuits along the broad lines articulated by the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges and by the Carnegie Foundation.

Internal Domain

Intrinsic motivators call on all the imaginative, intellectual, creative, and energetic resources of the individual faculty member. Usually, there is an ache, persistent and insistent, in the pit of one's mind that craves the nourishment of scholarship as a necessary supplement and complement to effective teaching. This drive leads one, somehow, to find the time and the discipline to pursue scholarly study, to organize it, share it, publish it, and incorporate it into one's daily personal and professional lives.

The internal drive toward scholarship was a leading theme in a series of informal interviews that we conducted with humanities faculty at Rockland Community College, Suffern, New York, while preparing to write this chapter. The faculty with whom we talked represented a number of disciplines, including history, media arts, philosophy, performing arts, and visual arts. Each of the faculty members had a desire to pursue scholarly projects and was spurred on by personal commitment to the vocation of scholarship, by the rewards of seeing the application of his or her own scholarly work, and by interaction with students.

Identification with Scholarship. Most of the faculty members consulted for this chapter were trained as scholars and never ceased thinking of themselves as scholars when they became teachers. They spoke of being motivated by a "spirit of inquiry" and an "insatiable curiosity," as well as by a love of their craft. A philosophy instructor spoke of the "mystery" of scholarship. He never really knows at the beginning where his research will lead; a new problem makes him receptive to new ideas and to rethinking old ones. The process of exploration puts him in touch with a "deeper sense of self."

Applications. Faculty members also spoke of the satisfaction derived from the applications of their scholarship. A history instructor spoke of the practical nature of his discipline, which is directed toward creating a tolerant and informed citizenry by presenting multiple perspectives about events and personalities. The philosophy instructor indicated that although the process of research and writing is its own reward, the only real value of scholarship lies in the insights that it provides. A video producer, who had not considered himself a scholar, acknowledged that his work contributed to the development of a new medium for presenting and interpreting research. A theater historian indicated that while her field, nineteenth-century set design, might appear esoteric, there is a connection between set design and audience as well as between set and the culture that defines the audience. A second theater historian related his "search for audience" as a scholar to his need for an audience as a performer. He termed both his acting and his writing as a scholarly exercise in "expressive language."

Students as Audience. Interaction with students also adds to the intrinsic rewards of scholarship. Although one faculty member indicated that he missed working with upper-division students and baccalaureate candidates in his discipline, all of the faculty interviewed viewed their students as an audience and related their scholarship directly or indirectly to their teaching. The philosophy instructor's current work on a textbook arose out of dissatisfaction with available texts. None, he felt, was flexible enough to meet the broad range of backgrounds and needs encountered in community colleges. The historian considered his students the literate public for whom he writes, in addition to his colleagues in the profession. He believed that having to contend with the diversity among students in a community college had enabled him to communicate more clearly than if he were writing only for professional publications, a skill attested by consistent feedback on the clarity of his writing. An English teacher indicated that his own writing has improved as a result of applying what he had learned in the process of teaching composition. He "gets back" from teaching a greater sense of his own potential as a writer.

Faculty scholars gain from their students, but they give as well. One of the theater historians has designed a humanities sequence for honors business students. It is her task, she says, to provide "detours" in life for these extremely goal-oriented students. She offers all of her students opportunities to attend live theater performances, which for some students is a first-time event, bringing a new dimension to their experience of drama. The video producer involves his students in research and production. They are able to see the beginning, middle, and end of his projects and thus serve as apprentices in the scholarly process.

The drive toward scholarly work leads to products that do not always fit the mold of traditional research but nonetheless meet the criteria of broader definitions of scholarship. The video producer mentioned above, for example, believed that his research was more like the investigation required for journalism, though in a different medium. However, at least one of his products, a video biography of Maxwell Anderson titled *Lost in the Stars*, meets Vaughan's (1988) test for scholarship. His research into his subject was, to use Vaughan's words, a "systematic inquiry" involving "critical analysis" and "precise observation, organization, and recording of information in the search for truth and order" (Vaughan, 1988, p. 27). His product is "shared with others and is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product" (p. 27). In fact, his product will not only be used and evaluated by scholars in American theater history but will also be used and critiqued for its artistic merit.

Institutional Support

In addition to the internal motivation of personal identification with the role of scholar, the satisfaction of seeing the direct application of scholarly work, and the interaction with students, faculty scholarship is often also fostered through institutional assistance. This institutional support takes many forms.

College Events. Often scholarship is promoted through involvement of faculty in events sponsored by colleges, specific departments, or student organizations. Rockland Community College, for example, used its yearlong thirtieth anniversary celebration to promote scholarship through lectures, symposia, film series, performances, and readings. Black History Month, Women's History Month, Hispanic Heritage Week, and an annual intercultural festival are also used to bring speakers to the campus and to provide faculty with opportunities to share their own work. The Maxwell Anderson Centennial, which involved the entire college community, included a symposium, readings for classes and the public, a film series, and a traveling historical exhibit. Development of the video biography of Maxwell Anderson, mentioned above, was also supported by the college as part of the centennial observation.

Support from Colleagues. Some of the faculty interviewed cited collegiality within their departments and the ability to receive feedback on their work as important factors in their scholarly lives. The English teacher's most recent publication, for example, grew from ideas that emerged as he planned for a faculty development workshop. (Productive professional development, however, was not always available, especially in small departments. The philosopher to whom we spoke, for example, is the only full-time faculty member in his discipline.) Faculty often augment this on-campus collegiality with involvement in professional organizations. These faculty attend conferences, although travel funds are often limited. Moreover, given the relatively low status of the community college in the postsecondary education hierarchy, most of the faculty interviewed indicated that employment at a community college was a handicap in professional organizations and in publishing (at least until individual reputations are established). For example, the historian noted that when he presents a paper at a conference, he is usually one of a handful of community college presenters; sometimes he is the sole community college presenter. Faculty who have participated in fellowship programs indicated that some seminar professors are condescending toward community college participants. When submitting articles for publication, some faculty give the names of their respective graduate schools rather than the name of the community college as their institutional affiliation.

Release Time. Several of the faculty with whom we talked said that they had been supported with release time to participate in fellowships. However, each mentioned lack of time as a major obstacle to scholarship and spoke about the ways that faculty cope with that obstacle. One faculty member, for example, indicated that she could not write in "bits and pieces." She therefore worked out a three-days-per-week schedule with her department chairperson in order to have two complete days for research and writing. When she needs to work on major writing projects, she plans a semester sabbatical. The English teacher, on the other hand, said that "it's amazing how much you can write in an hour and a half." He composes at the computer while his students complete their assignments. The philosopher keeps to a rigid schedule of writing several hours each day, and he completely withdrew from all "extra" activities on campus to complete his new book. The historian said that he "paces" his other activities and writes primarily during winter and summer sessions when he is not teaching.

Because time is essential for research and writing, scholarship in one's discipline must be recognized as a legitimate part of the faculty member's responsibility and as an important determinant of improved teaching and institutional vitality. Some colleges have taken steps to make it easier for faculty to engage in scholarship. At Rockland Community College, for example, the Rockland Community College Foundation is currently reviewing a proposal to provide grants for faculty scholarship during the winter and summer sessions. Small grants would free faculty from the need to teach overload courses during those sessions. The Scholarly Activities Program at Montgomery College (Maryland) is another example. Initiated in 1986-1987, the program makes funds available for faculty projects through the college's regular operating budget. In keeping with the broader definition of scholarship that applies to community colleges, a variety of faculty projects have been funded since the program's inception, including books, articles, bibliographies, lab manuals, photography exhibits, and paintings (Ganz, 1989).

College Consortia

In addition to institutional support, college consortia can play an important role in promoting scholarship. When a community college is part of a larger system of higher education, it can participate in and benefit from university-sponsored programs. The State University of New York (SUNY), for example, has been very supportive of faculty scholarship, although few SUNY programs exist specifically for community colleges and fiscal priority is usually given to the four-year colleges and university centers. For the last two years SUNY has funded sabbatical research opportunities for community college faculty, with three of eight awards applied to research in the humanities. In 1988, through a National Endowment for the Humanities grant to the SUNY Research Foundation, the university sponsored the program "Teaching the Western Heritage: A Program of Faculty Development," which consisted of a seminar series, each led by a renowned scholar in fields such as history, music, and literature. The SUNY Research Foundation also funds "Conversations in the Disciplines," a program that provides colleges with monies that help bring together scholars in various fields. In 1989-1990, one-third of these grants were for "conversations" in the humanities.

Another consortium model involves cooperation between research universities and surrounding community colleges. For example, in 1979, the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York (CUNY) approached the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation about the possibility of funding a program aimed at providing community college faculty with opportunities for research in the humanities. The CUNY Graduate Center proposal had two goals. The first was to give community college faculty half-time release from their teaching schedules to attend seminars at the CUNY Graduate Center and to work on research projects of their own choosing. The second was to give Ph.D. candidates at the Graduate Center the opportunity to intern at the home community colleges of the selected faculty. All parties benefited from the plan: the community colleges were not required to expend any funds; the Graduate Center provided its students with classroom teaching experience; and a major research university put its resources at the disposal of community college faculty aching for such an opportunity. In 1979, the Mellon Foundation, whose $70,000,000 budget usually includes only about $500,000 for community college projects, awarded $375,000 to the CUNY Graduate Center "to support education in the humanities at community colleges in the New York Metropolitan area" (Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York, 1990).

Since the project's inception, over thirty-four community colleges have participated; almost three hundred faculty members have been involved, with some coming from Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. The themes of the seminars have been varied, including American Civilization, Arts, and Society; Philosophy and Society; Poverty and Society; Myth, Psychoanalysis, and Modern Literature; Working Americans; Post-Structuralist Strategies for Reading Verbal and Visual Signs; and Revolutions in Science: The World Reconsidered. The research projects undertaken by faculty have likewise resulted in a variety of products, including books, articles, conference papers, and arts projects. The only restriction on the projects is that they cannot be used to complete graduate study requirements or doctoral dissertations.

Some of the participating community colleges were at first suspicious. There was a fear that the interns from the Graduate Center would be ineffective teachers and that the community college faculty would return to their institutions committed more to scholarship than to undergraduate teaching. But the results proved otherwise. The interns, for whom the community college faculty served as mentors, proved so effective that many were hired as regular adjuncts, and at least four were given full-time, tenure-track positions. For their part, the community college faculty returned to their institutions as reinvigorated instructors who shared their work with colleagues and students. Some even developed new curriculum options as a result of their investigations. On every level the project was so successful that even though it was initially conceived as a one-time award, the Mellon Foundation has twice renewed its support, each time for three-year periods. It has, in fact, become the largest running project of its kind.

External Agencies

External agencies constitute another important source of support for scholarship in the humanities. These agencies include government-sponsored organizations, foundations, and professional associations. Although most of these groups generally favor faculty at four-year colleges and universities, community college faculty have increasingly been given equal consideration.

Many opportunities are available through these organizations to fund faculty scholarship in the humanities. For example, the National Endowment for the Humanities has a number of funding programs, including fellowships for full-time study on independent research projects, stipends for research projects that can be completed in summer sessions, and grants that help faculty travel to and use the humanities collections of libraries, archives, and museums. The U.S. Department of Education's Fulbright-Hays program is another example, offering group study and support for individual projects. The National Endowment for the Arts also awards individual fellowships in dance and choreography, design, creative writing, film and video production, music (composing and performing), theater (performing and play writing), and the visual arts. The National Endowment for the Arts also sponsors two exchange fellowship programs for creative artists, one in Japan and one in France.

Professional associations are another source of aid and often serve as conduits between colleges and funding agencies. The Community College Humanities Association (CCHA) has a minigrant program and publishes a journal. Although many of its grants and articles have been related to pedagogy, CCHA encourages scholarship in the disciplines. CCHA's parent organization, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), has also been active in funding humanities projects. Recently, AACJC established an "Advancing the Humanities" project, utilizing a $503,391 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to provide fifty-nine community colleges with funds for a variety of humanities-related projects. Prince George's Community College in Largo, Maryland, for example, utilized its grant to help faculty attend a seminar on Greek mythology held at the Center for Hellenic Studies in Washington, D.C. In addition, faculty peer writing groups have been established at the college, and a monthly column on faculty research now appears in the college's faculty newsletter.

Summary

Individuals, institutions, consortia, and funding agencies have found creative ways to support faculty scholarship in the humanities. Publications, grants, and fellowships that result from these endeavors should be recognized at faculty meetings and publicized in internal and external media whenever possible. Publicity about scholarship enhances the college's reputation, thus encouraging enrollment and boosting sponsor support. In addition, although it must never be a substitute for good teaching, scholarship makes an integral contribution to good teaching and should be given greater recognition in promotion and tenure decisions. In the quest to advance humanities among our students, the need for faculty scholarship should be a priority.

References

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. *Policy Statement on the Humanities.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1986. (Included in ED 311 822, 26 pp.)

Bennett, W. J. *To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984.

Booth, W. C. *The Vocation of a Teacher: Rhetorical Occasions, 1967–1988.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities in the Professoriate.* Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990. 151 pp. (ED 326 149)

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1988. 58 pp. (ED 293 578)

Ganz, D. "Scholarly Activities Program." Pamphlet. Rockville, Md.: Montgomery College, 1989.

Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York. *Fall 1990 Fellowships for Community College Faculty. Making Prophecy: Waiting for the Apocalypse.* New York: Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York, 1990.

Howard, J. "Letter to the Editor." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* Mar. 28, 1990, p. B4.

Mooney, C. J. "Higher Education Conferees Applaud Carnegie Plan to Broaden the Definition of Faculty Scholarship." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* Apr. 11, 1990, pp. A1, A16.

Schaefer, W. D. "Much Scholarship in the Humanities Is Done Badly and Probably Shouldn't Be Done at All." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* Mar. 7, 1990, p. B4.

Vaughan, G. B. "Scholarship in Community Colleges: The Path to Respect." *Educational Record,* 1988, 69 (2), 26–31.

Barbara Viniar is dean of instructional and community services at Rockland Community College, Suffern, New York.

Libby Bay is professor in and chair of the Department of English, Speech, Philosophy, and Foreign Languages at Rockland Community College.

Professionals in all organizations need to be reminded periodically of their larger responsibilities, those that go beyond the day-to-day expectations of their jobs.

Nurturing Scholarship at Community Colleges

James C. Palmer

Calls for increased attention to scholarship at the community college strike a responsive but odd chord. They are reassuring, because they draw the institution back to its roots in higher learning. But they are at the same time disturbing, because they raise the specter of an institution at which scholarship, often viewed with indifference or disparagement, struggles for a foothold in the daily lives of educators. The fact that scholarship must be defended at all does not bode well, for without scholarship there is no college.

Community colleges are not the only institutions of higher education at which scholarship needs to be revitalized. Nor can it be denied that individual community college educators *do* make scholarly contributions. The preceding chapters are examples of attempts by faculty, deans, and presidents to reflect on the nature of their professions and to share these reflections with others. But these chapters underscore the fact that scholarship cannot be taken for granted; it must be attended to or it will be overshadowed by day-to-day college operations and pushed aside by those who do not understand the nature of scholarship and its connection to the community college mission.

How should scholarship be nourished at the community college? The previous chapters suggest four themes that need to be addressed in answering this question. The first is the need for a broad definition of scholarship that goes beyond original research without diminishing the rigor of the work involved or relieving the scholar of his or her responsibility to remain accountable for the results. Faculty ties to their disciplines constitute the second theme, for although many people envision instructors as "classroom researchers" focusing on instructional improvement, research on teaching cannot be divorced from knowledge of the subject taught. The third theme is the relationship between leadership and scholarship, a theme that spells out the difference between those who manage the institution and those who exert educational leadership. The final theme is professionalism and the role that scholarship plays in transforming the community college from a workplace to an institution of higher learning. This concluding chapter summarizes the assumptions underlying each of these themes, noting their importance to scholarly life at the community college.

A Broader Definition

If scholarship is tied solely to original research, then few community college educators will have the opportunity to be scholars. Most of these professionals have not experienced the apprenticeship in original research that Ph.D. programs provide. Only 12 percent of the faculty members at public community colleges nationwide hold a Ph.D. (Russell and others, 1990, p. 14). In the administrative ranks, the percentage is higher but does not constitute a majority; 40 percent of community college presidents have a Ph.D. (Green, 1988, p. 12) as do 33 percent of the deans of instruction (Vaughan, 1990, p. 29). Time and resources are also mitigating factors. On average, community college faculty spend about 70 percent of their time in the classroom, while four-year college faculty devote only 40 to 60 percent of their time to teaching, depending on the type of institution (Russell and others, 1990, p. 48). In addition, four-year college faculty are twice as likely as community college faculty to receive institutional or departmental support for research and five times as likely to receive federal research support (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989, pp. 60-61).

Recognition of the intellectual value of activities other than original research puts scholarship within the realm of the possible for the majority of community college educators and rids the institution of the excuse that its teaching emphasis precludes faculty and administrator involvement in scholarship. Other activities, listed by Vaughan (this volume), include work leading to op-ed pieces, lectures summarizing current thinking on a topic, art exhibits, bibliographies, new instructional materials, and technical innovations leading to patents. All involve systematic inquiry, through either the synthesis, interpretation, or application of knowledge, and hence follow the broad interpretation of scholarship advocated by the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988) and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Boyer, 1990). They require the scholar to have a solid understanding of his or her field and of the new developments in that field. Some of these activities, including "popular academic writing" may even be more difficult to undertake than are traditional research activities because of the need to engage a broader and more diverse audience than that reached by formal research publications (Sledge, 1986). Finally, they are public activities, resulting in products that are open to the review and criticism of knowledgeable colleagues.

It is important to note, however, that the broad definition of scholarship advocated by the contributors to this volume is not an open definition. Educators should avoid lending the mantle of scholarship to activities that do not contribute to the larger profession. For example, assessment techniques used in the classroom to gauge student learning are often thought of as "classroom research," even though the instructor does not write up his or her results or otherwise formally share them with colleagues. Another example is "institutional research" that involves data collection without summary and distribution of the findings to the college community for comment. Each project, whether an assessment or an institutional research study, is a private activity. The former may have intrinsic value to the instructor and the latter may fulfill a governmental data collection mandate. But neither adds to the knowledge base of a profession or is tested through peer review. A faculty member must make his or her results public, and the work must contribute to the knowledge that exists in order for it to afford the author a professional identity as a scholar, according to Kroll (1990). The tasks of grounding one's work on rigorous study and crafting a product that withstands the criticism of knowledgeable colleagues are as important for those who engage in the activities listed by Vaughan as they are for those conducting original research. To proceed otherwise is to trivialize the college's scholarship program.

Faculty Ties to the Disciplines

While scholarship for university faculty leans strongly toward work in the disciplines, many tie the scholarly lives of community college faculty to the institution's teaching emphasis. For some, this tie is a practical outgrowth of the nature of faculty work at the community college. Cohen and Brawer (1989, p. 87) for example, suggest that faculty professionalism at the community college might best be built around the "discipline of instruction" because faculty are not expected to conduct research in their disciplines and because their connections to the subject-area disciplines are simply too weak to serve as bases for scholarly activities. Others emphasize the need for faculty to systematically analyze their pedagogy with the aim of improving instruction and student success. For example, Cross and Angelo (1989) and the members of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988) call on community college faculty to use their classrooms as laboratories for instructional improvement. Although they are not advocating research in the traditional sense, they nonetheless try to legitimize faculty work on instructional improvement through a theoretical allusion to scientific, laboratory-based investigations. Bell (1990) found that community college faculty were more likely to engage in research activities related to the applied mission of the college than in more traditional university research activities, validating this call for classroom research.

Scholarly attention to instruction is needed at the community college, where faculty must deal with heavy teaching loads and large numbers of academically ill-prepared students. But the scholarly value of pedagogical investigations rests largely on attention to scholarship in the disciplines, for it is only by knowing what students need to learn and perform in the disciplines that faculty can design instructional methods and assess their effectiveness. It is hard to envision a discipline-neutral approach to pedagogical scholarship, one that could be applied across all disciplines by instructors with varying academic backgrounds.

Furthermore, there is a danger that calls for a scholarship based on pedagogy will unduly discourage faculty initiatives in scholarly endeavors that have only indirect applications to teaching. As the preceding chapters point out, this imbalance in emphases can hurt the community college in at least three ways. First, students are ill-served if their instructors do not remain current in their fields. Both Vaughan (Chapter One) and Block (Chapter Two) point out that because the underlying assumptions and ways of knowing within disciplines change continually, it is a mistake to assume that formal graduate study prepares the faculty member for a lifetime of teaching. Second, a faculty member who is not engaged in scholarship can do little more than pass on information to students. Viniar and Bay (Chapter Six), for example, note that humanities faculty cannot help their students acquire the attitudes and skills of humanities scholars if they do not model these attributes in their teaching. Third, there is the matter of teacher morale. Parilla (Chapter Three) argues that love of a subject-area discipline usually leads an individual to teach in the first place. He argues elsewhere that engagement in scholarship activities is necessary if a faculty member is to maintain enthusiasm and love for his or her academic specialty (Parilla, 1986). Thus, opportunities to engage in discipline-related scholarship prevent burnout and help ensure that the teacher's love of learning is conveyed to students.

Cohen and Brawer (1989), Cross and Angelo (1989), and the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988) do not advocate that faculty abandon disciplinary scholarship. But misinterpretation and misuse of their calls for pedagogical work must be avoided. If rejection of research as a legitimate institutional function is one step away from rejection of scholarship entirely, an assertion made by Vaughan (Chapter One), then the practice of embracing pedagogy at the expense of disciplinary work is a corollary action that also limits the community college role in scholarship. Even worse, this practice encourages the false premise that pedagogy and discipline-based scholarship are separate orbs, thus weakening any attempt to improve instruction. It is true that the broad definition of scholarship legitimizes work leading to instructional improvement. But as the preceding chapters in this volume emphasize, the broad definition does not relieve the community college of its responsibility to encourage faculty ties to the disciplines.

Leaders as Scholars

If scholarship is to become an expected part of faculty members' professional lives, then college leaders must view scholarship as a key institutional role. Several chapters in this volume—especially those by Block, Parilla, Templin, and Perkins—argue that presidents, deans, and other leaders have a responsibility to communicate the importance of scholarship to the college community, to eliminate bureaucratic barriers to scholarly endeavors, and to ensure that scholarship becomes part of the institutions' reward structures. Other writers agree; Laabs (1987) and Kievitt (1986) argue for the inclusion of scholarship as a criterion in tenure decisions at community colleges. Vaughan (1989) points out that if college presidents and academic leaders do not view scholarly undertakings as important to their own positions, then they are unlikely to see such activities as something important to others. In their capacity as role models, as earlier chapters indicate, administrators can do much to encourage scholarship by pursuing their own programs of scholarly inquiry.

But the importance of administrators acting as scholars goes beyond positive influence on others. In Chapters Three and Four Parilla and Templin, respectively, note that scholarship is key to the success of the administrator's own effectiveness as an educational leader. By acting as scholars in the field of higher education and approaching institutional problems on the basis of disciplined inquiry in that field, leaders are more likely to make informed judgments that will be respected by others and that will help establish an educational philosophy on which all institutional endeavors can be grounded. In turn, administrators will be less likely to embrace educational ventures that are popular at the time but are based on questionable assumptions. An example can be found in the assertions that community colleges reduce unemployment, decrease business failures, or otherwise improve local economies through contracted training, small business seminars, and other services to the business community. Because numerous factors outside the control of colleges affect the economy, leaders who make their institutions responsible for economic as well as individual outcomes gain public relations benefits in good economic times but leave their institutions vulnerable to undue criticism when the economy slumps (Palmer, 1990, pp. 40-42).

This warning does not imply that service to the business community is inappropriate or that colleges have no effect on the economy. Nor is college service to business clients the only institutional initiative that requires scholarly reflection. But bald assertions about a college's effects on the community, made for the sake of public relations and with little supporting evidence based on scholarly inquiry, have long plagued the community college. If community college critics have unduly castigated the institution for failing to break down social class structures or otherwise achieve social ends for which no institution can be held accountable, community college leaders have not helped matters by making unstudied claims of positive institutional contributions to societal well-being (Cohen and Brawer, 1982, p. 365). The scholarly activities of reading, reflecting, and writing about the institution's role in higher education are the obligations of leadership.

Professionalizing the College Culture

The scholarly work advocated throughout this volume cannot be achieved without changing an institutional culture built on the false notion that the community college's teaching emphasis precludes faculty and administrator involvement in scholarship. The theme of cultural change is mentioned in each of the preceding chapters, but it is emphasized most forcefully by Vaughan and Parilla, who note that a long history of indifference and even hostility toward scholarship at the community college must be overcome. Calls for increased attention to scholarship are no less than calls for fundamental change in the community college.

Part of this change will be managerial in nature, with administrators encouraging faculty scholarship through the practical steps outlined in the chapters by Parilla, Templin, and Perkins. These steps include such activities as arranging forums that allow faculty the opportunity to discuss the results of their scholarly endeavors, providing monies and release time to support scholarly activities, and recognizing scholarship in personnel evaluations and reward systems. Examples of such activities are presented by Purser and Scull (1989) and Lord (1988). Much can be done to make scholarship an expected and visible part of college life.

But the limited role of scholarship in the community college is largely a product of the failure of administrators and faculty "to make the necessary connection between their obligations to their jobs and their obligations to the profession" (Vaughan, 1988, p. 29). Thus, the success of the managerial steps outlined above will depend on the ability of leaders to advance a sense of professionalism that rests on the responsibility of faculty and administrators to act as scholars rather than as employees or managers. For example, the limited release time usually available to community college faculty may do little to foster rigorous scholarship if the obligation to make scholarly contributions beyond classroom teaching is not recognized and endorsed by the faculty. (This point is illustrated by Viniar and Bay in their example, from the *Chronicle of Higher Education,* of the faculty member who viewed the community college as a means of escaping the obligations of scholarship usually imposed by four-year colleges and universities.)

Success in anchoring the profession around scholarship will not make the lives of faculty and administrators easier. As Templin points out, the production of scholarly work adds to the educator's workload, demands a great deal of discipline, and leaves one vulnerable to the criticism of colleagues. In addition, it requires administrators to treat faculty as colleagues and at the same time holds faculty to a higher standard of accountability than they have heretofore experienced. Some faculty may be put off by these demands, yet others will find a renewed sense of professional pride and purpose as community college educators. The task of making room for scholarship in the community college will not be simple, but, as Knodt (1988) points out, there are ways to overcome the obstacles and encourage faculty to become scholars.

The Ultimate Goal: Building a Community of Scholars

Professionals in all organizations need to be reminded periodically of their larger responsibilities, those that go beyond the day-to-day expectations of their jobs. The chapters in this volume constitute such a reminder, noting that the community college is not an institution to be sustained and defended for its own sake by a bureaucracy. Rather, it is an institution to be directed by professionals toward well-defined educational ends. Educators acting as managers and employees cannot provide this direction, but a community of scholars—those who base their work on serious and rigorous inquiry in higher education, teaching, and the disciplines—can. This characterization of leadership applies as much to universities as it does to community colleges.

The prevalent bureaucratic orientation of the community college (as opposed to an orientation based on scholarship) affects more than the work lives of faculty, who often labor under the officially sanctioned assumption that teaching and scholarship are mutually exclusive tasks. It discourages scholarly reflection on the purposes of the institution and on the ways that those purposes are met. This false dichotomy is evident in the tendency of many college educators to confuse data collection with research, to give more weight to public relations than to scholarly inquiry, and to latch on to educational fads without sufficient investigation of their merits. As a result, community colleges are often ill-prepared to meet demands for information on student outcomes or to provide meaningful indices of institutional effectiveness. In short, adherence to a false belief has limited the ability of the community college to chart its own course as an educational institution and to effectively respond to its critics.

In reminding us of our obligations to scholarship, the contributors to this volume point not only to the intrinsic value of scholarship but to its practical applications as well. Scholarship is key to the community college's identity as an institution of higher learning. But it is also crucial to the institution's viability and to the ability of community college educators to determine the role of the institution and hence the ends for which it will be held accountable.

References

Bell, S. "Research Activities of Community College Faculty: Experience at the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology." Paper presented at the 30th annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Louisville, Kentucky, May 1990. 26 pp. (ED 321 695)

Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities in the Professoriate.* Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990. 151 pp. (ED 326 149)

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *The Condition of the Professoriate: Attitudes and Trends, 1989.* Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989. 162 pp. (ED 312 963)

Cohen, A. M., and Brawer, F. B. *The American Community College.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Cohen, A. M., and Brawer, F. B. *The American Community College.* (2nd ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1988. 58 pp. (ED 293 578)

Cross, K. P., and Angelo, T. "Faculty Members as Classroom Researchers: A Progress Report." *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal,* 1989, *59* (5), 23-25.

Green, M. F. *The American College President: A Contemporary Profile.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1988. 46 pp. (ED 311 747)

Kievitt, F. D. "Tenure and Promotion Policies in the Two-Year College." *ADE Bulletin,* 1986, *83,* 6-8.

Knodt, E. A. "Taming Hydra: The Problem of Balancing Teaching and Scholarship at a Two-Year College." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* 1988, *15* (3), 170-174.

Kroll, K. "Building Communities: Joining the Community of Professional Writing Teachers." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College,* 1990, *17* (2), 103-108.

Laabs, T. R. "Community College Tenure: Teach or Research?" *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice,* 1987, *11* (4), 267-273.

Lord, T. R. "Spotlighting Faculty Scholarship at the Two-Year College." Unpublished manuscript, Department of Biology, Burlington College, Pemberton, New Jersey, 1988. 9 pp. (ED 301 264)

Palmer, J. *How Do Community Colleges Serve Business and Industry? A Review of Issues Discussed in the Literature.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1990. 62 pp. (ED 319 443)

Parilla, R. E. *Gladly Would They Learn and Gladly Teach.* Southern Association of Community and Junior Colleges Occasional Papers, vol. 4, no. 1. Charlottesville, Va.: Southern Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1986. 6 pp. (ED 263 949)

Purser, G. G., and Scull, S. D. "Community College Research. A Creative Approach to Enhancing Instruction." *Journal of College Science Teaching,* 1989, *19* (1), 26-29, 62.

Russell, S. H., Cox, R. S., Williamson, C., Boismier, J., Javitz, H., and Fairweather, J. *Faculty in Institutions of Higher Education, 1988.* Contractor report. NCES 90-365.

Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, 1990. 209 pp. (ED 321 628)

Sledge, L. C. "The Community College Scholar." *ADE Bulletin*, 1986, *83*, 9-11.

Vaughan, G. B. "Scholarship in Community Colleges: The Path to Respect." *Educational Record*, 1988, *69* (2), 26-31.

Vaughan, G. B. "Scholarship and the Community College Professional: Mandate for the Future." Paper presented at the 69th annual convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., March 1989. 20 pp. (ED 305 965)

Vaughan, G. B. *Pathway to the Presidency: Community College Deans of Instruction*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1990. 228 pp. (ED 318 526)

James C. Palmer is acting director of the Center for Community College Education at George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia.

INDEX

Academic dean: and college's intellectual climate, 50-52; and professional development, 52-53; as scholar, 55-57; and scholarly publications, 6-7; and scholarship, 12-14, 49-50, 57; and student scholarship, 53-55
"Advancing the Humanities" project, 67
Agencies, and scholarship, 67
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), 59, 67, 68
American Association for Higher Education, 51
Anderson, M., 63
Angelo, T. A., 35, 38, 71, 72, 76
Attitudes, and scholarship, 5-6

Baker, G. A., III, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48
Baker, P. J., 29, 33, 37
Baldwin, R. G., 32, 37
Bay, L., 1, 59, 68, 72, 74
Bell, S., 71, 76
Bennett, W. J., 59, 68
Bergen Community College, 59*n*
Blackburn, R. T., 41, 47
Block, J., 1, 17, 26, 72, 73
Boberg, A. L., 41, 47
Boismier, J., 76
Booth, W. C., 61, 68
Boyer, E. L., 1, 2, 21, 24, 26, 33, 37, 54, 57, 61, 68, 70, 76
Brawer, F. B., 19, 20, 26, 71, 72, 74, 76
Brookes, M. C., 31, 37

Carnegie Foundation, 61
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1, 43, 70, 76
Carter, C., 28, 36, 37
City University of New York (CUNY), 59*n*; Graduate Center of, 66
Clark, B. R., 29, 31, 37
Cohen, A. M., 19, 20, 26, 34, 37, 71, 72, 74, 76
College consortia, 65-67
Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1, 2, 21, 26, 41, 43, 47, 50, 52, 57, 61, 68, 70, 71, 72, 76
Community college: in college consortia, 65-67; and community service, 23-24; culture of, 4-9, 74-75; and general education, 23; history of, 30; intellectual climate of, 50-52; and pluralism, 22-23; strengthening scholarship in, 25, 69-76
Community College Humanities Association (CCHA), 67
Cowley, W. H., 28, 30, 37
Cox, R. S., 76
Cross, K. P., 27, 31, 35, 38, 40, 43, 47, 52, 57, 71, 72, 76
Culture, of community college: professionalizing, 74-75; and scholarship, 4-9

Discipline: faculty ties to, 71-73; isolation from, 20-21

Education Commission of the States, 51
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), 25, 12
Eliot, C. W., 29

Faculty: and disciplines, 20-21, 71-73; encouraging scholarship of, 25, 34-35; internal domain of, 62-63; present status of, 31-32; professional development of, 52-53; public school experience of, 17-18; release time for, 64-65; statistics on, 70; survey of, 24; and teaching/discipline orientation, 18-20
Fairweather, J., 76
Flick, B. C., 10-11, 12
Folwell, W. W., 30
Fretwell, E. K., Jr., 42, 47
Friedlander, J., 34, 37
Fulbright-Hays program, 67

Ganz, D., 65, 68
Garrison, R., 19, 26
German, K. L., 31, 37
Gilman, D. C., 29
Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York, 66, 68
Green, M. F., 27, 38, 70, 76

Hall, G. S., 29
Harper, W. R., 29-30
Howard, J., 60, 68
Humanities: publication by faculty in, 10; scholarship in, 59-68

Ignatius, D., 11

Javitz, H., 76
Johns Hopkins University, 29
Johnson Foundation, 51
Johnson, G. W., 3, 14

Kellams, S. E., 31, 38
Kievitt, F. D., 73, 76
Knodt, E. A., 35, 38, 75, 76
Kroll, K., 71, 76
Krotseng, M. V., 32, 37

Laabs, T. R., 73, 76
Leadership: and president, 40-42; and scholarship, 73-74
Lord, T. R., 74, 76

McCabe, R. H., 46, 47
Mellon Project, 59*n*
Montgomery College, 59*n*
Mooney, C. J., 43, 47, 61, 68

National Endowment for the Arts, 67
National Endowment for the Humanities, 67
National Science Foundation, 31, 38

O'Banion, T., 19, 26, 29, 38
Op-ed page, 10-11

Palmer, J. C., 1, 2, 69, 73, 76, 77
Parilla, R. E., 1, 18, 26, 27, 32, 38, 43, 47, 72, 73, 74, 76
Parnell, D., 52, 57
Parsons, M. H., 49*n*
Pederson, R., 20, 26, 36, 38
Pellino, G. R., 41, 47
Perkins, J. R., 1, 49, 56, 57, 58, 73, 74
Perry, A., 11, 14
Pluralism, 22-23
Presidents: public school experience of, 17-18; role of, in scholarship, 35-37; and scholarly publications, 6-7; scholarship by, 39-47
Prince George's Community College, 59*n*, 67
Professional development, of faculty, 52-53
Publications, scholarly: examples of, 10-12; and presidents and academic deans, 6-7; and rewards system, 7; support for, 64
Purser, G. G., 74, 76
Puyear, D. E., 56, 57

Release time, 64-65
Research: dichotomy between teaching and, 7-8, 17-26; history of, 29-30; and scholarship, 28-29
Resnik, E., 21
Rewards system, and scholarship, 7
Rockland Community College, 59*n*, 64, 65
Rose, R., 42, 45, 47
Roueche, J. E., 42, 45, 47
Ruscio, K. P., 19, 26
Russell, S. H., 70, 76

Schaefer, W. D., 60, 68
Scholar(s): academic dean as, 55-57; community of, 75-76; faculty as, 62; leaders as, 73-74; president as, 39-47. *See also* Scholarship
Scholarship, 1-2; and academic dean, 12-14, 49-57; agency support for, 67; and college consortia, 65-67; and community college culture, 4-9; definition of, 1, 60-61, 69, 70-71, dichotomy between teaching and, 17-26, 60; examples of, 10-12; and faculty, 62-63; future of, 14; history of, 29-30; institutional support for, 63-65; nurturing, at community colleges, 69-70, 75-76; past view of, 3; and president, 35-37, 39-47; program for, 34-35; recommendations on, 14, 25; and research, 28-29; and teaching, 32-33
Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities in the Professoriate, 61
Schuster, J. H., 52, 57
Schwab, J. J., 18, 26
Scull, S. D., 74, 76
Seidman, E., 7, 8, 15, 29, 30, 32, 38
Shils, D. E., 19, 26
Siehr, H., 19, 26
Silber, J., 41, 47

Simonds, P. M., 36, 38
Sledge, L. C., 71, 77
State University of New York (SUNY), 59*n*, 65
Students: as audience, 62-63; encouraging scholarship of, 53-55; general education of, 23; new, 22, 27

Tappan, H. W., 30
Teaching: and research, 7-8, 17-26; and scholarship, 32-33, 60
Templin, R. G., Jr., 1, 39, 48, 73, 74, 75
To Reclaim a Legacy, 59
Townsend, B. K., 39, 47

U.S. Department of Education, 67; National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty, 24

Valverde, L. A., 27, 38
Vaughan, G. B., 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 13, 15, 17-18, 26, 28, 32, 38, 39, 43, 44, 47, 48, 50, 52, 56, 57, 58, 60, 63, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 77
Viniar, B., 1, 59, 68, 72, 74

Wheeler, D. W., 52, 57
Whitehead, A. N., 17, 26
Williamson, C., 76

ORDERING INFORMATION

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES is a series of paperback books that provides expert assistance to help community colleges meet the challenges of their distinctive and expanding educational mission. Books in the series are published quarterly in Fall, Winter, Spring, and Summer and are available for purchase by subscription as well as by single copy.

SUBSCRIPTIONS for 1991 cost $48.00 for individuals (a savings of 20 percent over single-copy prices) and $70.00 for institutions, agencies, and libraries. Please do not send institutional checks for personal subscriptions. Standing orders are accepted.

SINGLE COPIES cost $15.95 when payment accompanies order. (California, New Jersey, New York, and Washington, D.C., residents please include appropriate sales tax.) Billed orders will be charged postage and handling.

DISCOUNTS FOR QUANTITY ORDERS are available. Please write to the address below for information.

ALL ORDERS must include either the name of an individual or an official purchase order number. Please submit your order as follows:
Subscriptions: specify series and year subscription is to begin
Single copies: include individual title code (such as CC1)

MAIL ALL ORDERS TO:
Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers
350 Sansome Street
San Francisco, California 94104

FOR SALES OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES CONTACT:
Maxwell Macmillan International Publishing Group
866 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022

OTHER TITLES AVAILABLE IN THE NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES SERIES

Arthur M. Cohen, Editor-in-Chief
Florence B. Brawer, Associate Editor

CC75	Economic and Work Force Development, *Geneva Waddell*
CC74	Rekindling Minority Enrollment, *Dan Angel, Adriana Barrera*
CC73	Writing Across the Curriculum in Community Colleges, *Linda C. Stanley, Joanna Ambron*
CC72	Models for Conducting Institutional Research, *Peter R. MacDougall, Jack Friedlander*
CC71	The Role of the Learning Resource Center in Instruction, *Margaret Holleman*
CC70	Developing International Education Programs, *Richard K. Greenfield*
CC69	The Viability of the Private Junior College, *Robert H. Woodroof*
CC68	Alternative Funding Sources, *James L. Catanzaro, Allen D. Arnold*
CC67	Perspectives on Student Development, *William L. Deegan, Terry O'Banion*
CC66	Using Student Tracking Systems Effectively, *Trudy H. Bers*
CC65	A Search for Institutional Distinctiveness, *Barbara K. Townsend*
CC64	External Influences on the Curriculum, *David B. Wolf, Mary Lou Zoglin*
CC63	Collaborating with High Schools, *Janet E. Lieberman*
CC62	Issues in Personnel Management, *Richard I. Miller, Edward W. Holzapfel, Jr.*
CC61	Enhancing Articulation and Transfer, *Carolyn Prager*
CC60	Marketing Strategies for Changing Times, *Wellford W. Wilms, Richard W. Moore*
CC59	Issues in Student Assessment, *Dorothy Bray, Marcia J. Belcher*
CC58	Developing Occupational Programs, *Charles R. Doty*
CC57	Teaching the Developmental Education Student, *Kenneth M. Ahrendt*

FROM THE EDITORS

Clinging to the false belief that scholarship is tied solely to original research, community college educators have failed to see the numerous other ways that faculty and administrators can make scholarly contributions and thus enhance the reputation of the community college as an institution of higher learning. This volume of *New Directions for Community Colleges* examines the importance of scholarship to the community college and suggests approaches that community college leaders can take to promote a sense of professionalism built around scholarly work. Individual essays explore the definition of scholarship, the origins and implications of the false dichotomy between teaching and research, the steps that presidents and deans can take to promote faculty scholarship at community colleges, and the ways that scholarship in the humanities can be encouraged.

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges MAR 06 1992